


John B. DeHaan



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY AND HISTORY

ISRAEL IN PROPHECY AND HISTORY

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.

(Author of *The Old Book and the New Age*, etc., etc.)

GEORGE E. MAYCOCK



LONDON:

THE COVENANT PUBLISHING CO. LTD.

6 Buckingham Gate, S.W.1

1927

MADE AND PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY
THE GARDEN CITY PRESS LIMITED, LETCHWORTH, HERTS

1000-1

R-Israel

PREFACE

If the contents of this work tend in any measure to answer two questions constantly before the minds of thinking men at this present time, I shall have cause to look back with no other feeling than that of great thankfulness upon the labour and the research which the compilation of the book has entailed. These two questions are : (1) Are the British the lineal descendants of the subjects of the Kingdom of Northern Israel ? (2) If this be the case, are we to any adequate extent fulfilling the continuing obligations which still rest upon us having regard to our descent, and to the necessary implications derivable from the fact of that descent ?

In preparing the first chapter I have utilised certain material constituting an article on *Money*, which has already appeared in *The Record*.

P. W. T.



CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I. THE MODEL STATE	1
Chapter II. THE SEVEN TIMES	26
Chapter III. THE PROMISES	51
Chapter IV. THE THIRD DAY: THE LOLLARDS ..	71
Chapter V. THE THIRD DAY: THE PURITANS ..	97
Chapter VI. THE THIRD DAY: THE ANGLICANS	116
Chapter VII. THE THIRD DAY: THE DELIVERER	135
Chapter VIII. THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT: JOHN WESLEY	159
Chapter IX. THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT: THE METHODISTS	178
Chapter X. THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT: THE PROMISES FULFILLED.. ..	197

COLLECT FOR WHIT-SUNDAY

GOD, WHO DIDST TEACH THE HEARTS OF THY FAITHFUL PEOPLE, BY THE SENDING TO THEM THE LIGHT OF THY HOLY SPIRIT ; GRANT US BY THE SAME SPIRIT TO HAVE A RIGHT JUDGMENT IN ALL THINGS.

CHAPTER I.

THE MODEL STATE.

"The Lord hath avouched thee to be a peculiar people unto Himself, as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all his commandments; and to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour."—*Deuteronomy* xxvi, 18, 19.

SOME little time ago, whilst perusing an able and interesting work on Christian Evidence, our attention was held by a story of a sceptic who had attained to faith by following the path of mental commonsense; by thinking out for himself how God, if there were a God, could have revealed Himself to man; with the consequence that he was suddenly overwhelmed with the fact that this course, which he had divined for himself, was precisely the route taken by the Deity of the Bible in His dealings with mankind. First of all there must be born a man with an unusually strong aptitude for spiritual things. This man must be isolated, to prevent declension to the common level. He must be educated by dreams or visions or other direct methods, such as remarkable tokens of favour shown to those who were obedient to the heavenly vision, and by swift chastisement falling upon the enemies of such revelation.

This course, pursued for a sufficiently lengthy period, would inevitably culminate in the favoured individual passing on a strong and impressive tradition of God to his descendants, who must be similarly isolated and educated. The process would have to be repeated over many generations, until the people were sufficiently steeped in the divine Idea for further revelation of the character of God through human beings specially chosen on account of their personal fitness as media for divine communication.

By long continuance in such dealing there would come a time when the people was ripe for a positive incarnation of the Deity Himself. But "a brief glance at the story of Abraham, perhaps the only God-fearing man on earth in his day, will show how he was isolated and educated. Israel in Egypt, the circumstances surrounding the Exodus, and the conquest of the Promised Land, fulfil all the requirements of the second stage. Then came the order of the prophets, inaugurated by a brief period of miracle in the days of Elijah and Elisha, to give an authority to what they and their successors had to teach. Then the nation was purged of idolatry by the captivity and restoration. Finally the God-man appeared, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. By this novel but impressive line of reasoning, the sceptic was led to faith."

With every word of this quotation we are in complete agreement. But we wish to stress the fact that the divine education of mankind as begun with Abraham and continued through Israel was an education intended to produce the broadest, deepest, happiest, most fruitful, and most enjoyable type of life, both in this world and in the next world. There was a tremendous revelation, culminating in the incarnation and crucifixion of our Lord, of the divine hatred of sin, and of the divine love and wisdom which enabled a righteous God to forgive the sinner without condoning the sin. The resurrection of Christ marked such a final triumph over all the powers of evil as we have not yet begun to understand, such a triumph as we perhaps lack mentality to understand. The Germans were beaten in the first week of the Great War, though it took fifty-one months to convince them of the fact. On the first Easter Sunday the great adversary was disposed of. The first Adam had fallen, seduced by the Satanic power. The second Adam had fought the foe on the very ground which he had usurped, and beaten him there, on that spot. The strong man armed had met a stronger. The resurrection stamps this fact upon history. Had mankind realised the triumph, all would have been over but the Hallelujahs. Blind to their own highest good, the human race has

largely rejected the accomplished fact, and continued in a wholly unnecessary condition of evil and wretchedness spiritual and economic, *from which we have already been delivered*. But the consequences of an accomplished fact cannot remain for ever in suspense and all the blessings procured by the victory of our Lord will yet descend upon those who are willing to receive them. As for the others "those mine enemies, bring them hither and slay them before me."

Now let us assert, in one brief paragraph which shall be as lucid and as final as we can make it, that the chief work of Israel, the Elected Race, is to spread abroad in the whole world the triumphs of Redeeming Grace; that Israel at its highest is the missionary and Bible-spreading Israel, an Israel baptised with the Holy Spirit and using the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, for the evangelising of all nations, and for the exaltation of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, everywhere throughout the globe on which we stand, and on which He once stood. To put it in the most concrete form possible, we think that when a British-Israelite pays his tithe into the Sacred Treasury, the first tenth of the tithe ought to be allocated to such causes as a sound evangelical foreign missionary society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Scripture Gift Mission, before the expenditure on home work is tackled at all. First things first and the supreme privilege and obligation which falls to our lot is the spreading of the Good News of the Saviourhood of Christ amongst those who know not of it. As for the remainder of his tithe, let him see to it that his duties to his own church and locality are thoroughly performed before sending further moneys overseas. We are asked to stress this point, and not without reason.

Having dealt with this tremendous factor of the Saviourhood of Christ with all the clarity but all the brevity to which we can attain, let us proceed to make our position clear with regard to the collateral matter of the Lordship of Christ. Had the world never fallen, and never needed a Saviour, it would still have needed a Lord, and it is our

own belief that the Incarnation would still have taken place, that our need might have been satisfied to the last limit.

But the question of the Lordship of Christ involves an enormous series of subjects, all having their beginning, and some perhaps their ending, on this earth. It involves, amongst other things, all those matters relative to trade, commerce, economics, finance, agriculture, sanitation, and so forth, which shall have their result in bringing about the full habitation of the globe by healthy, happy, prosperous, contented, well-fed, well-housed, well-financed, and well-governed people, fortunate beings who enjoy every hour of their work and of their play and of their rest. This fact has not been sufficiently realised in the past.

We shall, for our present purpose, be within the bounds of a reasonable accuracy when we suggest that the Saviourhood of Christ is the subject of the New Testament, and that the Lordship of Christ is the subject of the Old Testament. The three hundred chapters of the New are everywhere built upon the foundation of the nine hundred of the Old, and the Old is everywhere assumed in the New. We have in this paragraph stated the matter so succinctly that even a friendly critic might easily find fault with our so brief statement, but we submit that this summary will be held to be reasonably accurate by a reasonable man, at any rate for the end we have in view.

Which end is a very short inquiry into the history and economics of the Theocratic State of Israel. Being Theocratic, Christ was Lord thereof. What laws did the Lord lay down for the economic prosperity of the State which, of all dominions, principalities, and powers on this earth, was peculiarly His own?

The first point which we desire to stress is that the Bible informs us that the first Adam was a gardener, and the second Adam a maker of agricultural implements. * For three and a half years our Lord was the Teacher of Israel,

* See *Thine Increase*, p. 64. It is fair to state that some British-Israelites hold other views as to "the hidden years," in which we do not share.

but for probably four times this period he had wrought at the carpenter's bench as the farmers' friend. We think the economic implications of these two facts taken together are tremendous. In any country developed as its Maker would have it developed, agriculture must be the chief and favoured industry. Everything depends upon that. A healthy, sound, hardworking village stock, ensuring plenty of food for themselves and for the whole nation, tanned by the sun, hardened by their out-door life, this is the basis and broad foundation of the State. We shall find this matter to have been crucial in the history of later Israel, and refer to it again in Chapter X, where its full importance emerges.

For a man to put his best work and his capital into the land, he must have security of tenure. This the Mosaic Code provided. God took a nation of grumbling and cowardly slaves, and turned them into a nation of yeoman farmers. It is true that in the actual working out of the scheme forty years of wandering in the desert had to supervene. The evil report of the spies took the last atom of courage out of the hearts of the escaped serfs, and a new generation had to grow up of men drilled and disciplined, dwellers in tents living on simple food and accustomed to the toil of the march, before Palestine could be occupied, and the Theocratic State commence its career. Then it began, a nation chiefly agricultural, each man living on his own holding.

On the Promised Land being taken over by the Chosen People, it was parcelled out amongst the individuals in accordance with the terms of the most admirable compilation of land laws which has ever existed. The Code preserved the absolute rights which the Deity chose to assert as Owner, and ensured security of tenure to the occupiers. It provided against the land ever lapsing into the possession of a small number of aristocratic houses. First of all, God was the recognised Landlord. In recognition of His claims, a "whole tithe" of the harvests and of the increase of the cattle and sheep was to be paid to Him as rental. This "whole tithe" was settled on the

tribe of Levi, and became the greater part of the emolument of the priestly and professional classes.

Further tithes and dues and periodic free-will offerings brought the total rent and taxes up to the sum of a double "whole tithe." The Israelitish farmers were therefore perpetual leaseholders, under a theocracy, and, so long as they paid their rents and performed their dues, would never have been disturbed in the possession of their holdings. It was a sort of metayer system, with the startling difference that whereas the metayer paid over one-half the produce the Israelite at the most paid one-fifth. In England we used to be told that the annual profits of a farm should go "one-third to the landlord, one-third to the tenant, and one-third to the land." This does not appear to be an inequitable division, and proves that the Deity was pleased to be most indulgent in His dealings with those towards whom a greater stringency might reasonably and equitably have been displayed.

These leases individual Israelitish farmers could assign to one another, but never for a longer period than forty-nine years; and in no case beyond the Year of Jubilee. It was therefore impossible for the land to get into the control of a limited number of individuals. The possession of houses in walled towns was on a different system of tenure. Such a house, having been sold, could be redeemed by the vendor within twelve months. After the time of redemption had lapsed, the title passed absolutely to the purchaser. Five per cent. of each man's income went in Poor Rates, but this was part of, not in addition to, the gross rental. So long as the Law was obeyed, there was prosperity for Levite and farmer, and sufficiency for the poverty-stricken.

The various provisions relative to the treatment of the poor, as contained in the Mosaic Code, are exceedingly striking. Interest was not to be charged on loans granted to them. If a pledge were demanded for the loan, the creditor must stand outside the poor man's house till it was brought to him; he must not enter in and seize it. If a garment were taken in pledge it must be restored

before nightfall. The millstone must not be taken as security. If an Israelite were so poverty-stricken that he sold himself into slavery, such slavery could not be of greater continuance than six years, for in the Sabbatic year he must go free. If he obstinately refused this freedom, he must nevertheless regain his liberty in the Year of Jubilee, for in this manner does Josephus interpret the "for ever" of Deuteronomy xv, 17. (The Book of Leviticus supports Josephus.) The seventh year was a year of "release" of debts owing by the poor. Cruden says that release meant the non-exacting of the debts during that year, the imposing of a twelve months' moratorium. Others say that release meant release, and so it did. The Israelites were warned against refraining from lending to the poor simply because the "seventh year" was at hand. If they did not recover the debt from the indigent they should recover it from God. And when the Israelitish slave attained to his Sabbatic freedom he was not to leave the farmstead penniless, but was to receive a liberal, openhanded bonus. It was to be taken from "flock, threshing-floor, and winepress." The poverty of the poor was to be relieved, and the self-respect of the poor to be maintained.

The laws against theft were delightfully simple. They have been thus summarised by Josephus: "Let death be the punishment for stealing a man; but he that hath purloined gold or silver, let him pay double. If any one kill a man that is stealing something out of his house, let him be esteemed guiltless, although the man were only breaking in at the wall. Let him that hath stolen cattle pay fourfold what is lost, excepting the case of an ox, for which let the thief pay five-fold. Let him that is so poor that he cannot pay what mulct is laid upon him, be his servant to whom he was adjudged to pay it." There were to be no huge gaols maintained at the expense of the taxpayer for the reformation of the criminal. That reformation was entrusted to the person to whom the wrong had been done, who no doubt would attend to the matter with a

splendid adequacy. If a man stole let him sweat for it at his own cost, not at that of the community.

For the administration of justice seven magistrates were appointed in each city, "such as have been before most zealous in the exercise of virtue and righteousness." To each magistrate were allotted two Levites, who, we presume, fulfilled the duties of justices' clerks. The Mosaic legal system seems to have been similar to our own. And this similarity is held by some to be not accidental, but to be due to the deliberate intention of King Alfred, who whilst arranging these matters made constant reference to his Bible. From the local court there was an appeal to Jerusalem, where the case could be heard before "the high priest, the prophet, and the Sanhedrim." In the days of Samuel, it was his practice to go on circuit, as our modern Assize Judges do. Perhaps in later days, owing to greater settlement in the land, and definite centralisation at Jerusalem, this custom may have been no longer necessary.

One word as to the death sentence which was imposed for various offences, apparently on the principle that a criminal was better dead than contaminating the living. Execution was by stoning, which seems at first sight barbarous to the last degree. According to Sir Robert Anderson it was the reverse of cruel, as the intention was that the first stone cast should administer the anæsthetic. The remainder completed the work without any knowledge on the part of the victim.

With respect to the Sanhedrim, or Senate, Josephus finds it convenient to assume that this council had a continuing existence from the days of Moses. (Numbers xi, 16.) This matter is most obscure. Some sort of national assembly the Israelites seem to have had, and the Jewish historian quoted gives it as his firm opinion that the Israelitish monarchy was constitutional, not autocratic, and that government was to be carried on by the monarch in consultation with the priesthood and the Senate. Had this course been followed by Rehoboam, the split between Judah-Israel and Ephraim-Israel would not have taken place. (I Kings xii, 7.)

There are two matters connected with the economic laws of the Theocratic State to which we must devote a little attention. They have to do with the tithes and the festivals.

Having dealt at great length with both these matters in a previous work,* it is not incumbent upon us to repeat herein what may already be in the possession of the reader. But the lapse of time which has taken place since the appearance of the book in question gives us an opportunity of answering a query which is sometimes addressed to us and, incidentally, of introducing some fresh matter relative to the festivals. That query is: "In the light of further study and later experience how far are you now prepared to stand by your assertions and your calculations as to the Israelitish tithes as previously put forward by you?" We stand where we were, and have had no occasion to alter our views as previously expressed. Further research has merely confirmed them.

The results of our researches were contained in a volume which received some thirty reviews in various journals, religious and secular, Jewish and Christian. Many of these reviews were lengthy, others less so, but in practically every case there was evidence that the book had been carefully perused before the notice had been written. Not one of our reviewers challenged one single fact or figure advanced by us, and we think we may fairly claim, therefore, that judgment goes by default. If *The Accountant* and *The Jewish Chronicle*, *The Dispatch* and *The Wesleyan Methodist*, to mention a few out of a great number, had nothing but kindly and laudatory and lengthy treatment for us, we feel that we can rest content in the results of our study, with deep thankfulness that we have apparently been honoured, most unworthy though we be, in the bringing of light to bear on a matter of Biblical economics which has certainly been attended with some obscurity. We therefore, for our immediate purpose, merely summarise our findings. There were three tithes, not two. And there were certain other offerings. But they were not all of

* *The Whole Tithe.*

them handed *in toto* to the Sacred Treasury. An Israelite who gave his "whole tithe" gave two shillings in the pound of his income, and would be richly blessed for doing so. An Israelite who completely fulfilled the will of God would surrender four shillings in the pound. On the payment of these tithes and other donations depended the financial prosperity of the Israelitish State. And modern Israel can be blessed neither in things spiritual nor things financial till individual Israelites voluntarily practise the habit of the Whole Tithe.

As for the festivals, three times in each year had every Israelitish man to appear before the Lord, and when the Holy Place had been finally established in Jerusalem the gatherings of course thereafter took place at Jerusalem. Dean Milman makes the astonishing remark that attendance at the festivals was confined to the males, lest the atmosphere prevalent at these times of rejoicing should not prove conducive to the maintenance of female chastity, or words to that effect. Now even a worthy and lamented Dean may blunder badly if he expound Biblical teaching without constant reference to the Bible which teaches. And in certain passages of the Code it is clearly shown that a Jewish farmer might be accompanied to the festival by his daughter and his maidservant, the latter, we presume, being attendant upon the daughter, as his manservant was upon himself. (Once at the feast, however, manservant and maid were to share in the festivity, and apparently upon equal terms with their master and mistress.) We think that a girl going up to the national assembly under the eye of her father and surrounded by the family retainers would stand in no imminent peril such as that hinted at by the historian of the Jews. But we do see an exceedingly wise provision underlying the Divine suggestion—the suggestion almost assumed the form of a positive command—that the marriageable girls should take part in these great national assemblies. It would be inevitable that the young people of both sexes should be thrown into one another's society, and that individuals from widely different parts of the country should meet in

happy association. With the assured result that a considerable number of betrothals would take place between persons by no means closely akin. One of the perils always threatening a mountainous country lies in constant interbreeding amongst the inhabitants of each individual valley, with its certain outcome in a physically and mentally impaired stock. We have no doubt whatsoever that one purpose of the festivals was to bring about the introduction of fresh blood into the agricultural districts of Palestine.

We are informed that upon one occasion, very early in their Palestine history, and in crude and barbarous times, the observance of festival enabled the tribe of Benjamin to attain to a fresh start in life. Owing to horrible sin, this tribe had come down in numbers to a few hundred men, of whom only a proportion were married men. Their criminality was such that the remaining tribes had refused to give them their daughters in marriage. Here was a dilemma. But the problem was solved when it occurred to an Israelite with a genius for hair-splitting that giving a girl in marriage was one thing, and that having her carried off and married was another thing. The Benjamites on receipt of this hint hid themselves in the vineyards near the place of festival, and waited for the damsels to come out and disport themselves in the dances customary on these occasions. Then each man seized his maid, and they all married and lived happily ever after. The coach and four had, as usual, been driven through the Act of Parliament, and this without losing so much as a linch-pin. But we are convinced that the type of courting usually adopted in later days and on these joyous occasions would savour much less of the cave-man and much more of the normal and civilised gentleman. For, though certain laws contained in the Code relative to the position of womanhood may seem lowering to women when viewed from the Christian standpoint, that is a tribute to one fact only, and that fact the enormous influence which Christ Incarnate has wielded upon society. The position of women in the Mosaic economy was something infinitely

preferable to that of the women of the surrounding nations not governed by the Code. And there we must leave it, with the not inconsequent remark that the *lex talionis*, the "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" was, according to Josephus, very early read in terms of monetary compensation merely. Whether we have here Josephus the historian or Josephus the whitewasher we do not pretend to determine. There is reason for believing that a certain proportion of ancient tribal law had been temporarily incorporated in the Code, with the Divine permission, but not with the Divine approval, and this is fully explanatory of certain of our Lord's utterances, such as "it was said . . . but *I* say unto you." "Moses for the hardness of your heart suffered you . . . but from the beginning it hath not been so." Under the influence of the Incarnate Christ slavery gradually ceased to be, and the treatment of the criminal tends to be reformatory rather than merely punitive.

Closely associated with the observance of the three annual festivals was the observance of the weekly festival, the Sabbath. Each annual festival marked a turning point in the agricultural year, and a rest from labour. Each Sabbath was to mark the close of a week of successful toil. For when the tithes were duly paid, even the "devourer" was to be "rebuked," and the labour of man was never to be destroyed by man's terrible and eternal foe, the insect tribe. What the land received in work it therefore repaid in crop and that without diminution. A stranger passing thereby might help himself to a bunch of fruit or some ears of corn to eat as he walked on his way, and when the Pharisees rebuked our Lord's disciples for taking the ears of corn on the Sabbath and rubbing them in their hands it was the rubbing they objected to, not the taking. To pluck was their right. To rub savoured of work on the Day of Rest. Or at least this was the Pharisaic interpretation of the Code, the outcome of the idolatrous worship of the letter, which had reduced the joyous Law of God to a thing of Puritanic horror. We know little of the actual manner of Sabbath observance in the days of David,

but it was a day of rest, it was a day of joyous rest, and it seems to have been noted for happy gatherings of the country dwellers about the gates of their little townships. At a much later date the synagogue was instituted, and a portion of the Sabbath was devoted to simple worship therein—the reading and expounding of the law and the prophets, and prayer. Of course the essential of worship, sacrifice, the synagogue could know nothing of, the sacrificial worship of Jehovah being centralised at Jerusalem. We can, however, be certain about this, that the tithe-paying Israelitish farmer, as he joined his happy weekly assembly at the gates, and perchance, farmer-like, stole a glance at his fields lying out in the countryside beyond the walls, beamed jovially as he saw those fields presenting him a full return for the previous six days of toil expended upon them, and this without diminution through fungus or insect plague. And if it should happen that toll was levied upon them by the peripatetic stranger, the toll was limited in quantity to the man's necessities, and anyhow they had all been strangers in the Egypt from which they had been delivered. As God had given the manna to the wanderer so let them feed this other wanderer.

Of the seventy-four days in each year, which, so far as we can ascertain, were to be consecrated by the Israelite to the special remembrance of his God, seventy-three were to be days of sheer rejoicing. On the other, the tenth day of the seventh month, the spiritual atmosphere was changed. On this day in every year the man was to afflict his soul. He was to fast, to examine his conscience, to pray, to acknowledge to the centre of his being that he was a sinner, and his Maker a righteous and holy God in Whose eyes he appeared as a most unrighteous and unholy man. Without reservation or equivocation the nation and every soul in it were to take their proper spiritual standing and to confess to God, to one another, and to themselves, that they had no spiritual standing, that they were merely damned souls, and that they deserved their damnation. When a man gets down to this point he is on the threshold of salvation—perhaps within it. And on this day of affliction,

and only on this day, the High Priest entered into the very Holy of Holies with the blood of Sacrifice. Which was a great event for the Israelite, and the promise of a greater still. It has had its fulfilment. For us, Good Friday should be a day of strict and penitent observance, but at other times the worship of God should be much more joyous than is customarily the case.

It was promised that, though the frontiers of the country would three times a year be left defenceless through the total withdrawal of the personnel of the militia to the Capital, no foreign invasion should ever take place during the continuance of a festival. Whilst the people were "rejoicing before the Lord" they were peculiarly under the protection of the Lord. To come down to modern times, why is it that the Salvation Army have to report that "the praising corps is *always* the successful corps"?

On one occasion, of course, possession of the land was lost to Judah-Israel for seventy years. It was a "clause in the lease" that the land should lie fallow for one year in seven, to recover, one supposes, after the tremendous harvest which marked the sixth year. After the institution of the monarchy the Sabbatic year was not observed; as time went on and the wayward nation showed no sign of fulfilment of their contract, the Owner intervened, and during the Babylonian Captivity the land kept her lost Sabbaths. The tithes were not always paid as they ought to have been, and this "robbery of God" was visited with ensuing harvests of the most meagre description. The Jews themselves held that this laxity occasioned worse evils than a thin harvest. "We have lost our land," says the Midrash, "only because tithes were not duly paid."

The Biblical scheme of economics, and there is such a scheme, is individualist, not communist, and one can no more speak of Christian Socialism than of Christian Satanism. In the Old Testament we behold the building up of the Model State. Also its ultimate fall through flat disobedience to the Giver of all good things. The individual's natural and healthful desire for acquisition was, through the operation of the tithing laws, to be at the same time

thoroughly satisfied and drastically controlled. But the Law fell into contempt.

The trouble with the Theocratic State throughout large eras of its earlier history lay in the fact that it did not sufficiently realise the Theocracy. Because the Ruler was not visible, He was not there. The tribes therefore hung loosely together, and did not always render to one another adequate assistance even in time of war. By way of making allowance for this human failing, and to give a human rallying point such as earthbound souls could appreciate, God permitted His people to have an earthly monarch allotted to them. This partially overcame the difficulty. It eventually wholly overcame it, for the time being. The tribes drew closer together, and Israel became compact for war. But still there was adhesion of Judah, Benjamin and Simeon on the one side and of Ephraim-Israel (the remainder of the tribes, Levi omitted) on the other. David reigned for seven years over Judah and then reigned for thirty-three years over the whole of Israel. Solomon reigned over the whole of Israel. In the later years of David and the earlier years of Solomon the Divine purpose of unity had been fully achieved. In the earlier years of David it was maturing, in the later years of Solomon it was departing. A harsh answer from a royal fool definitely cut Israel athwart, but this was only the culmination to which the later Solomon had led.

It seems as though in the original occupancy of the land at the conclusion of the wilderness wanderings one preliminary blunder was the cause of much trouble. Reuben, Gad, and one half of Manasseh obtained from Moses the right of seizing territory on the eastern side of Jordan, instead of the western, and this on condition that their troops crossed the Jordan with their fellows to carry out the necessary work of extirpating the Canaanites. The work was necessary for this reason, that the Canaanites had fallen into such sexual sin as a nation does not recover from. After long time granted them for reformation no reformation had taken place. They could only propagate children like unto themselves, and it was a kindness to

those children that they should not be born. The Canaanites must therefore be devoted to utter destruction, and all their "high places," places devoted to cruelty and lust parading under the name of religion, must be overturned and finished with. This work was never thoroughly accomplished, and we believe the failure to complete the task had its origin in the necessity for getting the armies of the two and a half tribes back to their wives and families after seven years of almost successful service. "Almost successful" will not do when God's work is in hand, and hundreds of years after it was Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh who were the *first* to go into captivity.

"Though the mills of God grind slowly,
Yet they grind exceeding small."

If it were ultimately owing to the action of these people that a Canaanitish leaven corrupted the whole of Israel, they must be the first to feel the impact of consequent disaster.

Moreover, the tribes which had actually crossed the Jordan and settled there did not sufficiently bestir themselves in dealing with the task which had somewhat unfairly been left to them to accomplish alone. Josephus gives a lively account of a nation hastening to share enormous booty and to possess themselves of their holdings whilst still contemptuously tolerant of the near presence of Canaanitish towns which, being left in existence, were inevitably destined to poison the whole countryside and to render the work of the Israelites nugatory. He particularly dwells upon the fact that the land of Palestine was so richly fruitful that, lured by the sight, Israel started farming whilst she should have been still fighting. The final result was the virtual loss of their farms, when, through the era of the Judges, they continually and for long periods found themselves working their holdings for the benefit of those to whom they had to pay tribute. The slave who had become a freeholder had now become a free-holding slave. It sounds paradoxical, but it was true. And it was bitter. In their desire to attain wealth, the Israelites were absolutely in the right. But a prior task awaited them,

and this task imperfectly accomplished, their wealth became sordid, grinding, wracking poverty.

The Canaanitish leaven did its work, and involved Israel in disaster, until the times of the monarchy, and more particularly in the days of David, when the land was temporarily purged of idolatry. David was able to leave his son Solomon an enormous inheritance, and a valorous nation of yeomen and soldiers. All things started fairly. Solomon simply had to march straight on from the position to which his father had attained. Despite the awful initial blunder attendant upon the non-destruction of the Canaanitish people, God had, in the long last, so wrought through His servants that Israel, at the commencement of Solomon's reign, was very much what He had intended that Israel should become. As we shall have occasion to note later in this work, we continually in Israelitish history come across our old friends Arminianism and Calvinism in action, the wilfulness of man delaying God's work, whatever the Calvinists may say to the contrary, and the determinate power of God ultimately bringing about the designs of God, whatever the Arminians may say to the contrary.

It was the clearly revealed will of God that the capital assets of Israel should be large and increasing. On leaving Egypt, they spoiled the Egyptians. During the wanderings they secured huge booty from conquered adversaries. As they approached Palestine, they found a country ready prepared for them, and that both by the providence of God and the handiwork of man. As regards the former it was "a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, springing forth in valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates; a land of oil-olives and honey—thou shalt not lack anything in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass." And with respect to the latter they inherited by conquest "great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not, and houses full of good things which thou filledst not, and cisterns hewn out, which thou hewedst not, vineyards, and olive-trees, which thou

plantedst not." So great was the importance, in the Divine mind, of the wealth thus entrusted to their stewardship and enjoyment, that this recapitulation of national assets occurs three times in the Old Testament.

Jerusalem attained to enormous wealth about the middle of Solomon's reign, a wealth which it was intended should be utilised for the benefit of the whole earth, and a wealth towards which God had been leading His people for centuries. Idolatry and folly turned this plethora into a mere curse, and the nation declined from that moment. Israel might have exclaimed :

"I have touch'd the highest point of all my greatness ;
And, from that full meridian of my glory,
I haste now to my setting."

Solomon misunderstood the use of the monetary resources entrusted to him, and in a man of his sagacity this misunderstanding must have been wilful. The gold which he acquired he used for purposes of oriental display, rather than for purposes of coinage, and when it came to making two enormous contracts with Hiram, bound himself to pay in kind and not in cash. "I will give to thy servants . . . twenty thousand measures of beaten wheat, and twenty thousand measures of barley, and twenty thousand baths of wine, and twenty thousand baths of oil." He further committed himself to hand over to the household of Hiram "twenty thousand measures of wheat, and twenty measures of pure oil . . . thus gave Solomon to Hiram year by year." Whatever the harvests of Israel had been, whether there was plenitude or starvation, this tax on the food supply of the nation must be faced annually, during the continuance of the contracts. Now, it ought to be the first effort of a ruler who knows his business to see that there is plenty of food in the land. Well-fed men make no revolutions. The gold utilised for the ornamentation which appears to have afforded the Queen of Sheba such signal delight should have been coined and devoted to purposes of trade, domestic and foreign. Had there been excess of wheat in Palestine, part of it would have come back in purchase thereof. Had there been dearth, better the small

harvest which you can eat than the gold which you can only look at.

Jerusalem just before Jeroboam was Paris just before 1789. Solomon may have exclaimed, "it will last my time" as Louis XV. did later. But their successors had to complete the sentence—"after that the deluge." Let us at this point lay stress on the fact that a man who buried £250 in the earth for a year or two instead of handing it over to his bankers, at interest, received our Lord's severe condemnation.* It was keeping the metal out of circulation. Solomon's gold lions and other trumpery kept the metal out of circulation. The Queen of Sheba was overpowered at the display, but a hungry Israelite who watched the wheat going out of the country in payment of the King's debts felt, first of all in his digestive organs, that in some mysterious way wealth did not tend to well-being.

Had those metallic assets been used as God intended, not for the glorification of the Sovereign in senseless display, but for the convenience of his subjects, as an essential medium of commerce, both King and subject would have realised that wealth and well-being were, in certain important respects, one and the same.

It is true that our Lord said, "Blessed are ye poor," but, in Palestine in His day, wealth too often could only be attained by such recognition of the Roman power as came near to recognition of idolatry. As Professor David Smith has luminously written, "When the nation was under heathen domination, disloyalty to Jehovah was the condition of worldly advancement . . . thus it came to pass that 'poor' was practically synonymous with 'godly.'" We do not think that we are wresting Scripture if we suggest that the underlying thought embodied in this beatitude may be expressed in the words, "Blessed is the man who puts his principles before his purse." All Scripture was written for our learning, and if it were the will of God that the Theocratic State should be liberally endowed with wealth, the individual Christian must not be afraid of the responsibility of controlling wealth, and of using those metallic

* See *The Old Book and the New Age*, Ch. II.

counters by means of which we so readily transfer wealth—money. If the history of Israel be the history of the individual, as our Puritan forefathers taught, we must be prepared to learn the lesson. As the Israelites honoured God with their substance, that substance was increased. So is it intended to be with us. All power is intended to be placed at the disposal of the Creator, and no power is to be looked upon with contempt as unworthy of our Maker's service, if it has been put within our reach, or if it be the will of God that it should at any time come within our honest grasp.

A vast number of Christians are far too much afraid of wealth. There is, of course, a distinction between wealth and money, a distinction which it is vital to all clear economic thinking to maintain, and a distinction which is continually lost sight of through referring to wealth in terms of money. Wealth really means utility. Money means a parcel of metal counters used in trade, and wholly useless except for passing from hand to hand. You say that a pair of boots is worth forty shillings. A pair of boots is worth hundreds of miles walked dryshod and in comfort. Forty shillings are worth—well, either in silver or in gold they are worth practically nothing. The silver might be made into a spoon, though a horn spoon would equally answer the purpose. The gold—but we give it up. Minute quantities of it are used in photographic work. Extremely minute quantities were used in old-fashioned medical practice to inoculate persons suffering from profound depression. But it is perhaps the most essentially useless of all metals. For some mysterious reason, which it is exceedingly difficult to fathom, gold has always been an object of intense human desire, so much so that wealth is continually exchanged for gold, and gold can invariably be exchanged for wealth by a man who has sufficient sense to transform glitter into utility. Says Mr. Hartley Withers, no mean authority upon the subject, "It is doubtless a *mere convention* that gives gold its commanding position." The convention is one upon which civilisation as we know it well-nigh depends. Let us beware, however,

lest we be so blinded by convention that we lose sight of the facts. Money is only useful for what money can do. It is useless in itself. Its primary utility lies in its employment as a wage fund. The capitalist is a boon. The Christian capitalist may be, and ought to be, a stupendous godsend.

Within certain clearly defined limits, money is power. Half a million will build a cathedral or a casino. In either case the greater proportion of the capital involved will be expended in labour and in building material. What the manufacturers receive for the latter will again largely be spent upon labour. In short, cathedral or casino, the stored-up power of which money is the token has been liberated in such a manner as to provide a multitude of workmen with employment over a prolonged period. To this extent its use is wholly good in either case. But when one comes to consider the ultimate effect of the two contrasted edifices upon the morals of the locality, one is forced to the conclusion that happy is the people amongst whom the power lies in the right hands.

We have asserted that the prime reason for the existence of the Israelitish nation was that it might become a medium for the revelation of God to the whole human race. This was and is true of Israel under both Covenants. But in one important respect a most radical difference between the methods employed in carrying out this responsibility emerges when we contrast the circumstances of Israel before the Incarnation with those prevailing after this supreme event. Under the older Dispensation religion was to be localised. The Temple of God was at Jerusalem. To this shrine the nations were to come. It was only after the resurrection that Christ said, "Go." "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation." "And they went forth, and preached everywhere." We have searched into the matter with some diligence, and do not know of one single penny of the amount annually devoted to the service of God which could, in Old Testament times, have lawfully been allocated to what we now call "foreign missionary work." It is true that before the

days of our Lord Jewish communities had for purposes of trade settled in various parts of the Roman Empire and had attracted to themselves a considerable number of proselytes. But this is another matter altogether. We never hear of a coterie of zealous Israelites banding themselves together to support a Levite sent to foreign parts to teach the Israelitish religion to the heathen. They had no money for this purpose, and it was a purpose outside the Divine intention at that era. In the Divine idea a great, healthful, moral, upright, and markedly prosperous State was to be set up, with Jerusalem as its centre of government and worship, and those of the heathen who had the wit to recognise the mystery of this unbroken record of successful achievement were to come to Jerusalem and to seek the solution of the mystery there. The Theocratic State was to attract inwards. The Christian Church was violently to hurl itself outwards. In the days of the Law God was in Heaven, with Jerusalem as His footstool, and men were to betake themselves there as to a throne of Grace. In the days of Christ God came down from Heaven, and that condescension of God was to be completed and fulfilled by His Church taking the good news to all men everywhere in their own homesteads. The message of Moses was, "Come in, and be blessed." The command of Christ was, "Go out, and bless everybody."

So unfaithful were the two branches of Israel, Judah-Israel and Ephraim-Israel respectively, to the Law given them, that only for a very short period of the national history could Jerusalem fulfil its function as a light-bearer to the world. In the days of David and Solomon it began to be that, and it might have continued to be that. The Queen of Sheba came up to learn the wisdom of Solomon. In the days of this monarch the whole world must have stood on the very threshold of a tremendous revelation of Divine truth. Solomon merely had to be faithful, and he and his successors would have had the heathen for their inheritance. The nations would eventually have come up to the centre where truth was to be learned to attain knowledge of that truth, compelled by sheer necessity. The mere success, military

and economic, of the Israelitish State would have encompassed this result. Solomon relapsed into idolatry, and there was soon nothing to be learnt at Jerusalem save a superstitious beastliness which could with equal ease be acquired at home. Thenceforward Israel, at any rate northern Israel, did little in the way of teaching the heathen the mysteries of God until the days of Paul the Benjamite.

After Solomon occurred the definite cleavage of Israel into North and South. As regards the South, there existed a continuing succession of rulers, some good and mostly bad, but all of them in the direct succession from David until the Babylonish Captivity. Subsequent to this a partial return of Judah, Benjamin, and the Levites, a rebuilding of Jerusalem, and a waiting of centuries, under foreign rulers, for the Messiah. The Messiah came. Jewry, purged by the Captivity of idolatry in the usual sense of the term, but never heart-whole in their loyalty to the living God, had by this time found a fresh idol in the letter of the Law. They were orthodox, but, as Wesley remarked, "a man can be as orthodox as the Devil—and as wicked." The Messiah was crucified.

But what of the North ?

Under varying dynasties of sovereigns ruling by doubtful title they had plunged further and further into the pit of idolatry, iniquity, and poverty. It seems as though the nation became depleted in its population. At length, in an era of which the year 721 B.C. may be taken as a convenient and central date, it seemed as though God had finished with them. They were no longer to pollute the land with their presence. They were dragged forth from a territory to which they have never returned. And from that time Biblical history knows Ephraim-Israel no more. They are absolutely lost.

Now let us take a rapid view of their career up to this point. Abraham is brought from the north country, has an enormous domain promised to him, and has Isaac, the son of promise, born to him. Isaac is the father of Israel. We are inclined to comment upon the fact that throughout their wanderings the patriarchs seem to have been noted for

doing useful things, particularly excelling as well-sinkers. Israel had amassed a huge fortune through his knowledge of cattle-breeding. The family provided Egypt with a prime minister of the most outstanding ability in the person of Joseph. The importance attached by Pharaoh to the retention of this man's services led to his marriage with the daughter of Potiphera, priest of On. As in mediæval England, statecraft in Egypt in the days of Joseph seems to have been an appanage of the priestly class, and to avoid the complications incident to jealousy it would appear that Pharaoh brought about the alliance in order to overcome this jealousy. Joseph prepared the way for Israel's descent into Egypt. The purpose of the descent is to be found in the peculiar climatic conditions of Egypt at that time, which conditions brought about an extraordinarily increased fecundity. A populous nation was to be produced rapidly from a trifling clan numbering seventy persons in all. When the fullness of time had come an even greater than Joseph led the people forth. The divine displeasure fell upon the head of the cruel taskmaster and his false gods. Nearly every one of the "plagues of Egypt" was a deliberate insult to one or other of the gods of Egypt.

Then followed the wanderings in the desert, till the stock born in serfdom had died out, and had been succeeded by a generation of men. All this time God visibly led His people. Where the pillar of cloud stopped, there the nation stopped. The tabernacle would be set up, and around it, each tribe in its own place, there sprang up a city of tents, with streets and the booths of handicraftsmen. When the pillar moved, the nation moved also. The Law was given, for soul and body, and the manna for the body. Sound theology, economics, and hygiene; pure food, fresh air, drill, discipline, all worked together to build up a people fit for the double work which the Deity had in hand, the extirpation of the vile Canaanitish races, too far gone in sin for repentance, and the subsequent foundation and consolidation of the Model State.

The Promised Land was reached, and the Canaanites not wholly extirpated. The tribes settled comfortably

each in its own preserve, and paid but little heed to the necessities of their fellows. If an attack were made on the confines of Judah, it was not immediately and necessarily followed by the mobilisation of the militia of Ephraim. The sense of nationhood was inert, and that obligation to the God of Israel which should have afforded a sufficient stimulus to a laggard patriotism unrecognised. Eventually a king was granted to them as a national rallying point, and for a while things went better.

But the partial transfer of national obligation from Temple to Court led, through ultimate human inefficiency, to the final undoing of the race. It was the business of the Temple to lead men upward. On the whole, the kings seem to have made it their business to lead men downward, and the nation cheerfully followed the king. The God of Israel allowed time for repentance, as He had done to the original possessors of the soil. It was unavailing, and there followed the Assyrian and Babylonish Captivities. For there was this marked difference between the Canaanitish and the Israelitish peoples, that the Canaanitish races were of such a character that once a certain point was passed there was no possibility of repentance, and there remained only destruction ; whilst Israel, though she attained an even deeper level of depravity, might yet repent, and yet do her work in the world. The Canaanite was a filthy brute ; the Israelite a vile-hearted man. For the Canaanite therefore utter destruction. For the Israelite, prolonged and terrible chastisement, with the certainty of ultimate restoration, and a fresh and successful attempt, under altered circumstances, to do "the first works."

This is the Biblical teaching upon the matter, as regards both branches of Israel. The subject is rendered all the more interesting from the facts that the exact duration of such chastisement has been revealed to us, and that the Assyrian and Babylonish Captivities, the beginnings of chastisement for Ephraim-Israel and Judah-Israel respectively, were widely apart in time. So therefore must their endings be.

CHAPTER II.

THE SEVEN TIMES.

“ If ye will not be reformed . . . I will smite you, even I, seven times for your sins. . . I will chastise you seven times for your sins.”—*Leviticus* xxvi, 24, 28.

THERE are three schools of prophetic students, the Praeterists, the Futurists, and the Historicists. The Praeterists believe that prophecy has already been fulfilled, and, though with certain reservations, one may refer to Dean Farrar's work on the Revelation as a specimen of their best work. Always remembering, however, that Farrar thought that there might be a certain law of circularity in prophetic fulfilment, and that the close of the cycle of the first fulfilment might inaugurate the era of a second. There may be something in this hint ; it is just possible, for instance, that the Revelation of which he wrote may have had (1) a fulfilment during the first generation of the church ; (2) a second during the whole duration of the church ; (3) a third and rapid fulfilment at the very end of the period of the church. This idea will bear discussion. When one finds earnest and good men holding one or other of the three prophetic positions with stern tenacity, it is not impossible that all three have got some knowledge of truth. The Futurists, of course, hold the belief that prophecy deals with that small period of time, still future, which relates to the closing years of the church's activities. Whilst the Historicists hold that “ God's clock has never stopped ” and that the fulfilment of prophecy is continuous and uninterrupted. If we are to choose between these three modes of thought, then we are bound to affirm that the Historicist argument has been completely made out. They have proved their case. If it is only mentally permissible

to belong to one prophetic school at one time, then the Historicist school is the one that claims our allegiance on the ground of sheer reason and proven fact. But if we have greater intellectual liberty than this, then the present writer holds the view that the Historicists are absolutely right, whilst the Praeterists and the Futurists are not wholly wrong. There may be something in Farrar's and Arnold's theory of cycles.

In modern days, the works of Grattan Guinness are particularly noteworthy products of Historical thought. Years before the war he was in a position to indicate the years 1914 and 1917 as of immense importance in the future history of the Jews. He applied the great key of the "Seven Times" to events in the past record of the Jewish nation, and the door unlocked. But his work was marked by one most extraordinary omission. He had no doubt whatsoever that the Israel of prophetic scripture is a literal Israel, a nation and not a church, and in one passage speaks vaguely of Israel being still somewhere in the north, waiting their final union with Judah. But it never seems to have occurred to him that the key which would open Judah's lock would equally open the gate to the way of truth as regards Israel also. Five minutes spent in quiet calculation, from the data which he had amassed, would have turned Grattan Guinness into the greatest protagonist of British-Israel Truth who has ever lived. Others noted the omission, and the tools which Guinness supplied have been utilised with marvellous result by the Rev. G. H. Lancaster and Mr. Llewellyn Thomas.

It will be convenient to assume that the reader is wholly ignorant of this theme, and to start building the scheme from its very foundation, as this will tend to clarity in presenting the issue. And probably the simplest method of introducing the subject will be to give an instance of the use of the year-day theory, and to explain and expatiate afterwards. The basis of the year-day theory is to be found in Ezekiel iv, 5.

In Daniel ix, 25, we read "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto

28 ISRAEL IN PROPHECY AND HISTORY

Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." That is, a total of sixty-nine weeks.

Sixty-nine weeks elapsed after the commandment to rebuild Jerusalem had been received, and nothing happened. Which fact ought not to have disconcerted a Jew trained to the observance of the Mosaic code. He had had it deeply instilled into him that a week meant seven consecutive and equal periods of time. He went through his six days of work, and then enjoyed his Sabbatic rest. That was a week. He toiled through his six years of labour, and then came the Sabbatic year of ease. That was a week. And when sixty-nine ordinary weeks had transpired and nothing had occurred, he knew that the week of prophecy meant the week of years. Everywhere in the prophetic Scriptures, unless it is otherwise clearly stated, a week means seven years and consequently a day means a year. Sixty-nine weeks means 483 years. Which perhaps explains why that "righteous and devout" man Simeon was "looking for the consolation of Israel" just at the time when he was. It had certainly been "revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ." But spiritual illumination not infrequently comes as a result of devout study of Scripture. And from his study of Scripture he knew the time was drawing near.

Now G. H. Lancaster submitted this prophecy to examination, and found that, reckoning $365\frac{1}{4}$ days to the year, the prophecy of the 483 years found its fulfilment in A.D. 26, the year of our Lord's entrance upon His ministry, if he started his reckoning from the year 458 B.C., the date of the *first* decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. If the reckoning started from 444 B.C., the date of the *second* decree of the same ruler to the same effect, then, on a calculation of 354 days to the year, we are brought to this same date precisely, the year A.D. 26.

The sole point of which lies in the fact that $365\frac{1}{4}$ days is a Solar year, and 354 days is a Lunar year, and that therefore the Inspirer of Prophecy has made and may make use of both. We may infer that when both a solar and a lunar

prediction falls out on the same date, that date will prove to be one of the extremest import.

But we have not yet finished with Daniel's prophecy of the weeks. Let us turn to Sir Robert Anderson. We are now to make use of a year of 360 days, and if this flitting about between 354, 360, and $365\frac{1}{4}$ days seems disconcerting ; if, as Professor Beet rather tartly suggested about Grattan Guinness, it is a mere conjuring trick by which one can make prophecy mean anything or nothing, we must simply entreat the patience of the reader until the whole matter is made sufficiently clear to a thinking mind. It is the humble desire of the writer to bring matters to the point where he can declare, with Dr. Johnson : " Sir, I have found you a reason. I am not bound to find you an understanding."

Sir Robert Anderson was struck with the key words of the text, which words are " Messiah the Prince." He pointed out the particular applicability of this expression when viewed in the light of what happened on the first Palm Sunday, and reminded us of the fact that we are expressly told that the triumphal procession into Jerusalem was in fulfilment of the prophecy, " Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem ; behold thy King cometh unto thee." " It was," says Anderson, " the only occasion on which His kingly claims were publicly announced." Counting up day by day from the date of the second decree of Artaxerxes to this Palm Sunday, Anderson found the period to be exactly 173,880 days. This, the first part of his calculation, necessitated lengthy time, the most meticulous care, and much correspondence with learned members of scientific societies and so forth. He eventually got the matter settled—173,880 days.

The second part of the calculation occupied him about sixtyseconds. Sixty-nine prophetic weeks consist of 483 years, and 483 years of 360 days each total 173,880 days. *Q.E.D.*

Thus far, our illustration, in which we have applied the lunar, the solar and the prophetic year (354, $365\frac{1}{4}$, and 360 days, respectively) to the famous prophecy of the Weeks ; and found each one to be a key that turns a lock.

The 354 days, being the lunar year, may be taken to be the ancient Israelitish method of computing time, and its use in relation to the Scripture calls for no comment. That the Solar year, the acme of exactitude, should be found of use in unravelling mysteries put before us for our solution by the God of Order causes us no surprise. But that we should find ourselves faced with a third year of 360 days, corresponding to nothing in the Heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth, is indeed a matter for wonder. We note that Lancaster and Thomas are inclined to ignore this division of time—the latter won't even know it. But there it is. The expression forty and two months is clearly held in the Scripture to be the equivalent of 1,260 days, comparing various passages in Revelation one with another. If three and a half years equal 1,260 days, then one year is 360 days. The same period is expressed both in Daniel and in Revelation as "time, times, and a half." If time, "times" and a half may be otherwise represented as 1,260 days, then a very simple arithmetical calculation proves that the value of a "time" is again 360 days. *A "time" is thus a year of 360 days.* And when the word "day" is used prophetically, as we have seen, from the examination of the prophecy of the weeks, that day means a year. Seven times are thus 2,520 years. One word of caution; when "time" is used with reference to an individual, the value of the day is an ordinary day, not a year. Thus, when Nebuchadnezzar experienced the "seven times" of his humiliation, it means that his peculiar habits and his vegetarian diet lasted over a period of 2,520 days only. We shall deal with this incident more fully in the next chapter. When God chastises a man, a "time" is 360 days. When He chastises a nation, a "time" is 360 years. Briefly to recapitulate, the word "day" in prophecy indicates a year (save, we may parenthetically remark, in those rare instances in which, following St. Peter's clue, it is found to indicate a millennial day of 1,000 years). This year-day may be a lunar (354 days), a solar ($365\frac{1}{4}$ days) or a prophetic (360 days) year. A "time" is 360 years, *lunar, solar, or prophetic.* And

Seven Times is a consecutive period of 2,520 years, solely lunar, solely solar, or solely prophetic.

But this brings us no nearer to the reason for the existence, in the mind of God, of a year of 360 days which apparently has no existence in reality. Sir Robert Anderson refers to it as a luni-solar year, and evidently means what G. H. Lancaster says when he suggests that the "prophetic year is the mean between the lunar and solar years." Which, unhappily, it isn't.

As we have never, so far as our memory serves us, had the fortune to meet with any work on prophecy which went to the root of this problem, we are going to indulge in the luxury of one or two pages which we humbly hope may be explanatory of the mystery.

In the Old Testament we are informed of a catastrophic happening in the days of Noah, when the earth was submerged under an inundation. Noah, forewarned, was instructed to build an ark, of certain dimensions. In recent years, a Dutch nautical expert, intrigued by the story, made certain calculations, which proved that the dimensions furnished would provide the largest tonnage possible; in other words, that Noah's "barge," as Dr. Moffatt will call it, being wholly made for floating and not for navigation, provided the last inch of cubic space attainable by the methods of naval architecture. The cell of the honey-bee and the ark of Noah, respectively, solve the problem of the securing of the last atom of storage space attainable under all the conditions of their respective problems. In this ark Noah and his family escaped the inundation which destroyed the remainder of the human race, if the word "earth" in Genesis vii has the signification which it now bears. Of course, this story of the flood is one of the last of the Biblical narratives which the average man can bring his mind to accept. Something must have occurred, because the legends of every nation have some account of the event. Generally speaking, the current attitude even of orthodox apologists is to diminish the catastrophe by minimising and localising its effects. Thus, we have been told that the "high mountains" of Genesis

vii, 19, should have been translated "sandhills," a somewhat startling change of nomenclature. Colgrave and Short walk delicately when they approach the subject. "Words in the Bible, as in any other old book, are used in the sense which they bore at the time of writing, and not in the sense that they have come to bear to-day. It was the then known world that went under the deluge, and the then known animals that were preserved alive. We do not believe that Abraham went out of the world because the same Hebrew word is used in Genesis xii, 1, as is translated 'earth' in the narrative of the flood. When Luke says all the world was to be taxed, he obviously does not mean South America." They go on to say that there is ample proof that the "early home of the human race, northern Persia, Armenia, and the neighbouring countries, has been under water at a comparatively recent date."

McCready Price would rush whole-heartedly in the opposite direction and knows nothing of local limitation. Writing as a geologist, he says "there has obviously been a great world catastrophe. . . This sounds very much like a modern confirmation of the ancient record of a universal Deluge ; and I say confidently that no one who will candidly examine the evidence now available on this point can fail to be impressed with the force of the argument for a world catastrophe as the general conclusion to be drawn from the fossiliferous rocks *all over the globe.*" The italics are ours.

Major Davies, F.G.S., says that he "cannot think it possible to assign, as Professor McCready Price does, practically all geological phenomena to the effects of one brief Deluge." But in the second Appendix to his work, *The Bible and Modern Science*, Davies quotes with great encomium from three works by Sir Henry Howorth on this very subject of a universal catastrophe, and we must make use of a further quotation: "Sir Henry then shows how the evidence all points to the fact that great waves of translation have arisen from the sea, inundating all lands ; throwing huge masses of marine shells on to the coastal areas ; transporting great blocks of stone for vast distances ;

sweeping over the ground irrespective of its contour ; forming cross-striations on the rocks over which they dragged their sediments ; throwing up great ‘ tails,’ ‘ kames,’ and ‘ escars ’ of debris where their currents met ; and sorting and spreading out wide sheets of gravel, sand, and loam, over the face of all countries. In other words, the geological evidence completely confirms the paleontological evidence, and the evidence of universal tradition, etc., in testifying that an extraordinary Deluge, of world-wide extent, has overtaken nature at a very recent geological date, exactly as recorded in Scripture.”

Now, concerning this “ extraordinary Deluge,” we really do think that some light has been cast upon its occurrence by a book which appeared in 1925, under the title of *The Riddle of the Earth*, and penned by one who calls himself “ Appian Way.” To assert that the reader will find himself in agreement with all things contained in this work would be going a great deal too far. We are not called upon to discuss the author’s thesis in all its aspects. But when he affirms that this Noachic Deluge was the result of cometary impact, we experience a sudden illumination. Many previously existing difficulties of a scientific type simply disappear. The atmospheric envelope of the cometary body mingling with our own would bring about just such torrential rain as the world experienced. And the violent collision of a foreign body would cause those “ great waves of translation ” which “ inundated all lands ” and “ transported great blocks of stone for vast distances,” and so forth. We have probably all had the pleasing experience of standing meditatively on the margin of a still deep pool, lost in the contemplation of nature, what time a silly ass stole up behind us and dropped therein a geological specimen as large, as thick, and as heavy as his own head. Now just carry this idea and its consequences to the *n*th, and you will faintly imagine what the contemporaries of Noah had to contend against when the comet dropped itself into the ocean. This was “ the breaking up of all the fountains of the great deep ” whilst the rains are described as “ the opening of the windows of heaven.” A series of tidal waves

from below, a torrential deluge from above, this was the end of the old world.

It was the end of the chronology of the old world. When the comet struck the earth the impact was such, or the increased volume of the globe was such, that the world left its old course round the sun. It had been knocked out of position in space. "Appian Way's" remarks on this subject are of deep import, and we must "pluck an apple here and there." Thus—"Avebury consisted of 360 stones . . . five stones appear to have been added later. It is a natural inference that this huge serpentine temple was first erected when the year consisted of 360 days." "At Avebury the stones indicate a learned race of astrologers and astronomers, who possessed a 360-day year, and subsequently added five more days to it." "Tatian, Clement, and Eusebius all agreed that the Phæton event was identical with the Deucalion Flood. . . The Phæton account does definitely propose that at some past date a comet, like that of 1880 (a) coming from the direction of Sirius, broke into a tandem comet after perihelion, flung itself upon the earth in the regions of the Atlantic . . . and caused the Deucalion Flood." He adds further statements to the effect that the chronological systems of the world prove that many nations have had to add five intercalary days to their year, and that invariably such extra days carried with them the memory of misfortune. One further passage may be adduced: "As to the earth's orbit, we have, since civilised man lived on the earth and possessed the calendar, added five days to the year. Formerly, the year consisted of 360 days, now it is 365 days odd, and if anyone estimating the total weight of our globe takes one-seventy-third of it, he will be, perhaps, able to ascertain the added weight of this enormous series of deposits."

Now turn to Genesis. If the 150 days of vii, 24, run between the dates given in vii, 11, and in viii, 4—from the seventeenth day of the second month to the seventeenth day of the seventh month, this would appear to indicate a year of 360 days. Anderson's argument on this head

may appear to be diminished in value owing to the fact the five consecutive months of our own calendar, February to June, inclusive, also consist of 150 days. But to no other sequence of five months does it apply, and the circumstance arises solely from our weird treatment of the month of February. If five months cover a period of 150 days, twelve months cover 360 days. And so no doubt they did, up to the time of a cometary impact which destroyed an old world and started a new world on a new course. This 360-day "prophetic" year which has so much puzzled prophetic students, and of the origin of which even the great Sir Isaac Newton gave so laboured and erroneous an account, is simply the ancient solar year. To term it the prophetic year is a misnomer. The Historicist school have proved that all years are prophetic.

Notwithstanding the fact of the great work already done by the Historicists, we think that the world still awaits that profound and patient scholar who, adopting the year-day theory, will utilise it for the clearing up of all problems with the meticulous care displayed by Sir Robert Anderson in the matter of the 173,880 days. He set a standard of attainment to which, so far as we are aware, no other writer upon the subject has attempted to ascend. A mere amateur in these matters, we disclaim even the intention of emulating his work, and as regards anything which we shall ourselves endeavour after in this line of research, we wish it to be understood that we are merely a prentice hand, striving after such accuracy as we can compass.

We have seen that the prophetic term "time" in Scripture means a period of 360 years. Seven Times are thus 2,520 years. A solar year consists of 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 49 7-10ths seconds, and Seven Times (solar) consist, therefore, of 920,410 days. Seven Times in ancient solar years consist of 907,200 days. And in lunar years of 892,080 days. Therefore, having ascertained the solar date of any prophetic fulfilment relative to a Seven Times period, we have to deduct from this 13,210 days for the ancient-solar fulfilment, and 28,330 days for the lunar. Or 36.16 and 77.56 solar years, respectively.

We have already disclaimed Andersonian accuracy in the treatment of this question, and shall therefore regard these deductions as being 36 and 78 years, on the general principle that "if it's less than a half it's nothing, and if it's more than a half it's one." Perhaps our calculations may inspire some unfortunate but capable wight to do for all prophecy what Anderson did for one prophecy—prove it to the day, and thus qualify himself for undying fame and a very serious nervous breakdown.

One further pleasing little arithmetical tickler, and we can fairly get to business. The modern system of dating all events B.C. or A.D. has provided one horrible little trap for those whom duty calls or danger to the consideration of a consecutive period of time lying partly under the former era and partly under the latter. In passing from the "former days" to the "latter days" we pass the zero point. This in itself does not sound too terrible but, unless we are wholly mistaken in a matter of real importance, it does actually mean that one's calculations are more likely than not to be a whole year out, unless forewarned and forearmed.

If an era commenced in A.D. 1 which was to occupy 2,000 consecutive years for its fulfilment that fulfilment would end in A.D. 2001. This is as clear as daylight. But if it commenced in 1000 B.C. it would not end in 1000 A.D. unless it started on the first second of the first minute of the first day of January 1000 B.C. and was completely fulfilled by the last second of the last minute of the last day of December 1000 A.D. And even this statement is not accurate, for it is one second out. From 1000 B.C. to 1000 A.D. sounds like 2,000 years—and it isn't. From 1000 B.C. to 1000 A.D. is 1,999 years. If an era started on the first second of the first minute of the first day of January 1000 B.C. and was to be fulfilled in 2,000 years it would be fulfilled in the first second after the last second in the year 1000 A.D.—which is the first second of 1001 A.D. But if it is the first second even it is the year 1001, not the year 1000. Just carry this idea out when applied to the end of the year, not the beginning, as we

have done, and you will come to see how important the point is. In making our calculations with reference to the Seven Times we shall have to bear this constantly in mind, with the result that the said calculations will, to the unwary, appear constantly to be miscalculations.

What has hitherto been termed the prophetic year we have found reason for terming the ancient solar year. The title prophetic year may, however, well be utilised in its actual significance, as that year which runs between one Vernal Equinox and another. For instance, the prophetic year 1927 dates from March, 1927, to March, 1928. This must be carefully borne in mind, particularly as we have not felt called upon constantly to reiterate this caution in the ensuing pages.

Grattan Guinness and G. H. Lancaster regard this Seven Times chastisement as starting in the year 747 B.C., the year of the historical commencement of the empires comprised in Nebuchadnezzar's image. This, as Lancaster rightly remarks, would be the earliest moment from which we could possibly date the beginning of the great Seven Times. But would it be the accurate moment? We think that the Bible very clearly shows that it would not, and in a later chapter give our reasons for this conclusion. Meanwhile we follow Llewellyn Thomas, who dates the actual commencement of the tragedy not from Nabonassar's enthronement, but six years later. We have introduced Guinness's name into the matter, because of the existence of that amazing chart which is to be found between pp. 610 and 611 of the *Approaching End of the Age*. This chart has to do primarily with the chastisement of Judah. But, having mentioned Israel, he calculates 2,520 years from 747 B.C., which he assumes as the date of the commencement of Israel's chastisement, and finds himself confronted with the date 1774 A.D. Not quite knowing what to do with it, he says something about the French Revolution—which happened to occur in 1789. How it was possible for this most able man to escape the logical consequences of that train of thought which led him so accurately to forecast the future of the Jews; how he failed to see, with his own

calculations in front of him, that the chastisement of Israel must have ended as much earlier than that of Judah by just so long a period as it started earlier, how he escaped the following of his own clue to its own end, and finding that end in Britain, is a fact that fills one with astonishment. When he introduced Israel into the chart, and wrote down the dates 747 B.C. and 1774 A.D., he must have been within an ace of that tremendous discovery which he left to others to disinter from the midst of his own handiwork. But his followers now have clearer light, and must accept the revelation which that light affords, or in the alternative, wholly abandon Guinness and all his works. For them there is no middle way. If you are a Guinnessite you are a British-Israelite.

The commencement of the Seven Times punishment of Israel occurred, then, in 741 B.C. Its terminal dates are therefore 1780 A.D. (solar); 1744 A.D. (ancient solar) and 1702 (lunar).

The heavy chastisement of national deportation occurred in 721 B.C. The terminal dates are A.D. 1800, 1764, and 1722 respectively.

Even after the national deportation of 721 B.C. some "gleanings" of the people were left to be dealt with. All was safely gathered in by Esar-Haddon in 676 B.C. Terminal dates, A.D. 1845, 1809, and 1767.

It therefore appears that that Divine justice which inflicted the Seven Times of punishment was fully satisfied during an era of 2,520 years, the terminal period of which began in the year 1702, and ended in 1845. Just as the Divine displeasure had more and more to manifest itself from the period 741 to 676 B.C. so could the Divine mercy more and more manifest itself as the chastisement came nearer and nearer to fullest completion. If it be asked how was it possible for the Almighty to show open favour to an unrepentant nation, two answers, each equally pregnant, may be given. In the first place, it is written, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." In the second place, just as the tide of mercy began its course, in the year 1703, a little child was born in an Epworth

parsonage, now known to history as John Wesley. This man was so manifestly a medium for the power of God in turning men to righteousness, that an extraordinary phenomenon presents itself. During the whole of the eighteenth century England became more wealthy, and during the whole of the eighteenth century England became more godly. So inimical is increase of wealth to the well-being of a country merely nominally Christian, that had the Divine favour been manifested in the things of this world only, England of the later eighteenth century would merely have been overwhelmed in a revolution parallel to that of France, and synchronous with it. But God, who provided so abundantly for the material, had provided still more abundantly for the spiritual necessities of a restored Israel.

To revert to our previous paragraph, we have noted a series of dates which we now recapitulate in order. They are 1702, 1722, 1744, 1764, 1767, 1780, 1800, 1809, 1845. The years of lunar termination are 1702, 1722, 1767; of ancient solar 1744, 1764, 1809, and of solar termination 1780, 1800, 1845. Of these we take the year 1800 to be of outstanding importance, for this is the solar termination of the 2,520 years of travail when reckoned from the great deportation of Israel, in 721 B.C. By this time Wesley's tremendous task had been accomplished. The England of 1800 was spiritually on a vastly different plane from the England of 1700.

To complete our argument, we must again refer to the chastisement of Judah, so ably dealt with by Grattan Guinness, for there are many amongst us, Historicists even, who apparently will not see or cannot see that the punishment of Israel and of Judah are wholly separate and distinct things.

The chastisement of Judah began in the year 606 to 604 B.C., 135 years after the commencement of Israel's, 115 years after the main deportation of Israel, and 70 years after the last small residuum of Israel had been scooped up. The next two stages were in 598 B.C. and in 587 B.C. Not to weary the reader with detail, we may remark that that turn of the tide which occurred in 1702 in the case of Israel

could only occur in 1837-9 in the case of Judah, in other words, the long period of the gradually increasing favour of Judah could at its earliest only commence eight years before the *cloud had completely passed from Israel*. The solar termination of the three dates given, 604, 598 and 587 B.C. occur in 1917, 1923 and 1934. *

If this page should be perused by a Historicist who is not a British-Israelite, by one who fully accepts the argument of our last paragraph about the Jews—what is going to be his future position as regards Israel? You must have it both ways. If you recognise Judah, you are not at liberty to ignore Israel. You believe that Judah's punishment is rapidly drawing to a close, and rightly. Your belief is confirmed by the capture of Jerusalem in 1917, and rightly. You are fully assured of your case—as regards the Jews, the descendants of such portions of Judah, Benjamin and Levi as returned from Babylon. But what of the other tribes of Israel? You have accounted for three. What (counting the seed of Joseph as one) have you to say about the other nine? Was the Seven Times punishment of Leviticus to fall on Judah only? There is not a line of Scripture to prove this, and there are pages of Scripture which prove the contrary. If the punishment of the Jews is, taking a central date, to terminate in 1934, as you hold, what do you make of the fact that the punishment of the Northern Kingdom *must* have terminated generations before this?

Some persons claim that Israel returned with Judah from Babylon. Only 42,000 persons in all returned from Babylon, scarcely even an adequate representation of Judah,

* Differing historians have claimed 588, 587 and 586 as the date of the destruction of Solomon's Temple. If 588, the earliest date of the completion of Judah's chastisement is the Vernal Equinox of 1933. If 586, the latest date is the Vernal Equinox of 1936. The present writer knows nothing of Pyramid Chronology, but has been informed that one student of this subject claims that there are signs of a special period of three and a half years dating from March, 1933, to September, 1936, at which latter date Pyramid Chronology ends. Are we to take it, therefore, that March, 1933, has the evidence of two prophetic witnesses as to its supreme import? Time alone can prove.

and both Scripture, commonsense, the Apocrypha, Josephus, and geographical considerations prove that there was no intermingling of Judah and Northern Israel on this occasion. We shall prove this statement in its proper place. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that Israel and Judah returned to Palestine together at the end of the seventy years' captivity. Now where are we? The punishment of Israel, taking 721 B.C. as a central and convenient date, terminated in A.D. 1800. But the punishment of Judah, with whom Israel has, on the theory we are now considering, been hopelessly intermingled, so hopelessly that you can't tell which from t'other, terminates in 1934. Therefore, when God said 2,520 years, He really meant for the greater part of the nation 2,654 years, but did not succeed in expressing His purpose clearly. Which, in the case of anyone possessed of the slightest reverence for God and for Holy Writ, sounds like scurrilous and abominable blasphemy. If the Historicist who has hitherto failed to realise this fundamental truth of the different periods of Southern and Northern Israel's punishment—and the consequent chronological necessity for Northern Israel's coming again into the favour of God nearly a century and a half before Southern Israel is similarly restored to divine beneficence—will ponder the matter for a moment with an honest mind, we think that he will be obliged to accept our conclusions.

If he hesitatingly assert, "well, but surely, even on your own showing, there has been a breach in the House of Israel, and therefore Jeroboam's Kingdom cannot be fully blessed until Rehoboam's Kingdom has been healed, and restored, and the two branches reunited under God's full favour," then we are prepared to throw up the sponge and declare the contest off. We agree with our adversary. Always remembering, however, that we place the accent on the word "fully" in the fullest aspect of the word fully. There was a sadness when the prodigal returned and received the gold ring, the best garment, and the fatted calf from the father, but only the cold shoulder from the older brother. The Father will do all things in His time, and "the best is yet to be." Meanwhile He has restored Northern Israel

to power and plenitude in order to prepare a home for All Israel. England has been the best friend of the Jew. The two houses will yet representatively and unitedly occupy the territory promised to them, and Palestine, under Israel's rule and protection, has already shown promise of what it is ultimately to mean for the storm-tossed, persecuted House of Judah.

Though we may be somewhat anticipating, and reserve to ourselves the full right of returning to the same line of argument at a later stage, we think it convenient to deal to some extent at this point with certain difficulties which the honest student who has not yet accepted British-Israel teaching finds dogging his footsteps when on the way to British-Israel truth.

(1) "The promises to Israel are for the 'latter time,' and the 'latter time' refers to the millennium." This is an assertion which our foes are exceedingly fond of, and it happens to be wholly untrue. Take one passage from the Old Testament as representative of many we might adduce. In Isaiah ix we read "in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun . . . but in the latter time hath he made it glorious." Verse 6 states clearly that this "glory" attends the fact of the *birth* of Christ. It is not postponed to the millennium. Verse 7 speaks of the increase of His peace. You can't have increase of peace where there is already perfect peace. The passage is pre-millennial, and the promises are pre-millennial. The "former time" precedes the Advent, and the "latter time" starts with the Advent. Compare Acts ii, 17, and Hebrews i, 2 (A.V.).

It has pleased God to terminate Israel's punishment before that of Judah, in order that the millennium might be led up to and prepared for. This could only be brought about by commencing that punishment at an earlier date, as the period of chastisement was to be identical in both cases.

(2) "Israel must somehow or other have returned with Judah, because on our Lord's presentation at the Temple he was greeted by a member of the tribe of Asher." This

is indeed standing a cone on its apex. Orientals are keen genealogists, and there was a small mingling of Israel with Judah before the deportation of either. "As for the children of Israel which dwelt in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam reigned over them." (1 Kings xii, 17.) But the suggestion is sufficiently interesting to be further dealt with in the next paragraph.

(3) "When St. James wrote his Epistle he addressed it to 'the twelve tribes scattered abroad—greeting!' If by this he means all Israel, he must have known where to find them, and therefore the lost tribes were not 'lost' in the sense which the British-Israelites hold. Probably his expression is indicative of the fact that St. James regards the Israelites as having returned with Judah." Then in that case there is a marked dissimilarity of opinion between Ezra and Nehemiah on the one hand, and St. James on the other, and, if the latter were right, he should have written "to the twelve tribes gathered at home, greeting." Probably at the time that St. James wrote some persons may have had a fair idea as to where the Israelites were. Josephus, a later writer, had some inkling, and the Israelitish gravestones of the Crimea go down at least to as late a date as A.D. 6. But, in case there may be something in your contention, it may be noted that Henry's Commentary, written long enough before the days of the British-Israel movement, says on this text "the greatest part, indeed, of ten of the twelve tribes were lost in captivity; but yet some of every tribe were preserved, and are still honoured with the ancient style of *twelve tribes*." The writer is at least clear from the heresy of the return of Israel together with Judah at the rebuilding of Jerusalem. His view that every tribe of Israel was *represented* in Judah is an intriguing one, and we believe that it will ultimately prove to be true. Conversely, we shall shortly note that Judah may have been *represented* in Israel.

As regards the representation of Israel in Judah, we have already discussed one passage of Scripture bearing thereon when dealing with Anna the prophetess. It may be that in and after the days of Jeroboam some few of

the Israelites who came down occasionally, like Tobit, to the festivals at Jerusalem may, unlike Tobit, have remained permanently in the southern kingdom. If so, they cannot have remained in any large number. What would happen now if half the farmers of North Wales insisted on suddenly resigning their holdings and on settling in South Wales? Simply that the farmers of South Wales would kick them out, lock, stock and barrel. Add to this the fact that all Israelitish farmers were yeomen, and how is it to be expected that they would, in any number, surrender their livelihood and their ancestral acres for the penury of the landless man? Certain Israelites travelled to the Holy City for the feasts, and, the feast over, went back to wife and home and farmstead. A few of the more devout may have remained, and we suggest that those who did remain were artisans, not farmers, men who carried their livelihood about with them. Of such a sufficient number may have settled in the south, under possibly unrecognised but nevertheless actual Divine guidance, as to form a nucleus representative of every tribe of Israel. On the other hand, certain of the Jews as we should now call them, must, we think, have joined Israel in captivity, for in Obadiah 20 there occur the words "the captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad." An Assyrian inscription states that Jewish captives were transported by Sennacherib to Saparda some 120 years before the Babylonish Captivity. Saparda is in the same region to which Israel had been taken. The accuracy of the Assyrian inscription is confirmed by reference to 2 Kings xviii, 13.

In a letter written to the Rev. Merton Smith on November 18, 1918, the Chief Rabbi stated, "The people known at present as Jews are descendants of the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with a certain number of descendants of the Tribe of Levi. As far as is known there is not any further admixture of other Tribes." We most respectfully submit that there was a further admixture, but so slight in extent as scarcely to invalidate the Chief Rabbi's testimony. Meanwhile, let those persons who obstinately and foolishly cling to the assertion that

Israel returned with Judah after the Babylonish Captivity note the Chief Rabbi's unhesitating assertion. Whichever way you may read it, we do not think that St. James' "greeting" presents much difficulty. Whoever the addressee was, the letter eventually reached him, for you have a copy in your Bible now. And it was not one of the original addressees who summed it up as a "right strawy epistle" for, as Professor Ripley states, "ethnological comparison proves that the Anglo-Saxon peoples must be of an entirely different stock from the present German race." And Dr. Latham, "throughout the whole length and breadth of Germany there is not one village, hamlet, or family which can show definite signs of descent from the Continental ancestors of the Angles of England."

(4) "None of the clergy engaged in mission work amongst the Jews hold the British-Israel theory, which fact virtually proves the tenets of this school to be untenable." A rather sweeping statement, for if we remember rightly one of the leading British-Israel authorities was at one time engaged in this very work. But it may be admitted that certain clergy carrying on their labours in this field are opponents of the line of argument which we are now pursuing, from which fact shallow-thinking persons draw the inference that those who know the matter most like it least. This is as false a resultant as could be arrived at. These people are constantly under the influence of their surroundings, and a Judaistic surrounding is not always favourable to an Israelitish uprising. This has been the case since the time of Ezekiel—and before. "Thy brethren, even thy brethren, the men of thy kindred, and all the house of Israel, all of them, are they unto whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have said, 'Get you far from the Lord; unto us is this land given for a possession.'" (Ezekiel xi, 15.) We ourselves once knew a converted Jew who was so bitter over this matter that he informed us that if the British were Israel he really felt as though he would have to surrender all his hope in Christ. In other words, if the Jews had, in the Providence of God, to share their blessings with a nation whom they had held hitherto to be mere goyim,

then his intense national exclusiveness would tempt this particular sample of Judaism to rebel against God's whole plan and purpose both for time and for eternity. This is the underlying motive of the hostility of some "Christian" Jews to British-Israel teaching. They have in some cases infected their teachers.

(5) "The fact of the chronological necessity of Israel's punishment ending over a century before that of Judah is so striking that even a Praeterist or a Futurist must simply accept it. If a punishment which God said was to last for 2,520 years started in 721 B.C., as it did, it must have ended in 1800 A.D., and the matter is settled for any man capable of rational thinking. But this does not connect Israel in the remotest degree with England. I know that some British-Israelites have laid stress on the fact that General Booth had a Jewish nose, but the argument has failed to convince me."

General Booth had a Jewish nose because he came of Jewish ancestry, and Hugh Price Hughes derived his Oriental cast of countenance from a similar source. In their time they laboured tremendously and successfully for the evangelisation of the nations. They were witnesses for the future, in their day living prophecies of what the Jews will do for Christ when they have come to recognise their Messiah. But if they were Jews they were not of Ephraim-Israel. And this is a book chiefly about the latter.

To come to a resumption of serious argument, we shall at a later stage produce the promises of blessing made to Northern or Ephraim-Israel, which were to occur in the latter days, but which could scarcely begin *in their fulness* until the time of chastisement had begun to elapse, that is before the year 1702. (We shall see later that it would be in accordance with prophecy that certain blessings should commence after 1198). Meanwhile, we may briefly summarise them as increased dominion, maritime power, increased population, worldly wealth, possession of the "gates" of her enemies. To what nation save Britain did these blessings markedly accrue during the eighteenth century? Did they noticeably occur in the history of the

Afghans, or the Nestorians, or the Armenians, about this time? The prophetic history of Israel fulfilled itself in the actual history of Britain, and of no other nation. If therefore Britain be not Israel, Britain is a mere coincidence, and God's promises to Israel have completely failed—because they have not been fulfilled in the history of any other people *at the time when that fulfilment was to occur*. They were to be in the “latter days” which from Isaiah and other Biblical writers we have ascertained were to be post-Advent and pre-millennial days. They could not occur in their fulness till the times of chastisement had expired. (There was to be dawn from the thirteenth century, daylight from the eighteenth). At that very time, post-Advent, pre-millennial, and pronouncedly in the eighteenth century, they all happened in the history of Britain, and in that of no other nation. Praeterist, Futurist, Historicist, or plain ordinary unlabelled believer, we are all bound as honest men to face facts. And as rational men to give facts their due value.

We take it that if you believe that God could and did bring the whole of Israel out of Egypt into the Promised Land, he could have brought part of Israel out of Palestine into the Isles of the West. For this is what certain of the prophecies mean. These prophecies were gradual and cumulative. There is first mentioned an “Appointed Place.” Then a “Wilderness,” which word means in the Hebrew something very different from what it means in English. Then the “Isles of the Sea.” The Hebrew frequently employed the same words for “sea” and “west,” and “Isles of the West” is an equally fair translation, avoiding the tautology of “Isles of the Sea.” Such isles as were of so large an extent as to admit the entrance of a nation must have been “Isles of the Sea,” and obviously not islands of inland waters. “Isles of the Sea” is therefore verbal redundancy. “Isles of the West” is geographical clarity. To make it clearer still, they are described in Isaiah xlix, 12, “from far . . . from the north and the west.” As there is no word in Hebrew for north-west, it has to be expressed by the phrase “the north and

the west." In Jeremiah xxi, 10, they are described as "isles afar off." Islands afar off from Palestine, to the north-west of Palestine, capable in their geographical extent of providing land for the necessities of a nation—take your map and you will find such islands. They are coloured red, for our ancestors found them.

(6) "I am a Praeterist, and believe that the prophecies relating to the period of the Church were all fulfilled within the first generation of Christians." We are of the Historical school, and our belief differs from yours, though we are quite prepared to admit that there may have been, and probably was, a rehearsal of all Church history in that generation. To that extent we are ready to meet you, though we do not hold that the light of prophetic truth shone upon thirty years of Church history only, and that the remainder is clouded in thick darkness. Meanwhile, we are not discussing the Church, but Israel. The year-day theory has, we suggest, been proved to the hilt. You yourself as a rational being have been impressed with the number of facts which can be brought forward in substantiation of that theory. You know that a "time" is 360 years. If Israel's punishment commenced, say, in 721 B.C., taking the most convenient and central date, *when did it cease?* This prophecy runs for 721 years, or, adopting your own particular view of prophecy, for 751 years, during an era in which you yourself are prepared to admit that prophecy was operative. What happened after that? As a reasonable individual possessed of some arithmetical capacity, you are bound to find some answer to this question.

(7) "I am a Futurist, and hold that the last half-week of Daniel has yet to be fulfilled.* During the era of the Church there is an absolute hiatus in prophecy." We are not going to tell you that you are wholly in error, for only the future can prove that, and the future may prove that you had some grounds for your belief. Meanwhile face the facts. If Israel's punishment only lasted for, shall we say for purposes of argument, 750 years before the

* Many Futurists would say "week" in place of "half-week."

prophetical clock was stopped, and there is, on your theory, to be a further three and a half years of resumption of prophetic time at the end of the present age, and then the millennium, then, on your own showing, Israel will have to face one thousand seven hundred and sixty-six and a half years of chastisement during a period of perfect bliss lasting for one thousand years only !

We do ask the most serious attention of the Futurist school to the indescribable maze of contradiction in which their theory lands them when ridden too far. The Futurists are God-fearing men who believe their Bibles. May we, in the light of the last paragraph, respectfully ask them if they have fully understood their Bibles. For if they believe the Old Book, then let them believe that when God solemnly promised to chastise Israel "seven times" for their sins, He meant that promise, and He kept that promise. But it must be all over before the millennium, and, from facts we have previously brought forward, must have been over in the case of Israel nearly a hundred and forty years before there is a possibility of millennium.

As regards certain statements which we have made relative to the Noachic Flood we desire to add one or two further observations.

Firstly, if as "Appian Way" suggests, the astronomers of Avebury first experienced a day of 360 years, at the time of the building of their Temple, and then, in accordance with the apparent Biblical evidence, were all drowned in the Flood, how did they survive to add those five extra days to their Calendar of which the cometary impact was the permanent cause? We submit that Avebury is post diluvian, built by astronomers with sufficient knowledge of history to be aware that those extra five days were no part of the original year, and who in order to keep this in mind, erected a circle not of 365 monoliths, but of $360+5$, and clearly recognisable as such.

Secondly, the presence in Noah's Ark of 790,000 species of animals with their "better halves" completely staggers us. Here we have not a question of Bible versus Science,

but of Science versus Science. Sir Henry Howorth and other scientists prove, we think, the destruction of the old earth. The ark did not contain sufficient tonnage for the above-mentioned cargo. But we find the 790,000 species of animals existent to-day. What, in the name of all that is possible, did actually occur as regards the animal creation at the time of "Appian Way's" lamented comet?

This, that the then existent animals were preserved in the manner described. Then it pleased God to commence a work almost directly uncreational. It is probably still going on; the last occurrence of this type of which we have been informed is the case of the Shirley Poppy, in 1880. Scientists can only account for such sudden and amazing appearance of an entirely new species by a process of "unpacking." "Evolution in that case proceeds by the dropping, not by the adding, of characteristics." "Evolution—we may perhaps describe as the dropping of a factor from the constitution of the parent."

To this type of evolution, which is not a theory but a fact, Dr. Morton gives the convenient title "parvolution." It is not "creation," which consists as we understand it in the formation of the perfect, but of a course, as we have suggested, uncreational, the taking away of something there we presume from the sperm so as suddenly to produce a distinct variety. And if we can tabulate 790,000 species of animals now, this does not mean that Noah's menagerie contained this number of exhibits or, necessarily, a hundredth part of them.

We refer our readers to Dr. H. C. Morton's *Bankruptcy of Evolution*, Chapter X, for fuller light on this fascinating subject.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROMISES.

“ I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee, but I will not make a full end of thee ; but I will correct thee with judgment, and will in no wise leave thee unpunished.”—*Jeremiah* xlv, 28.

WE must now apply ourselves, though with as much brevity as possible, to the promises given to the fathers of blessings to descend upon Israel in “ the latter days.” These matters have been dealt with to finality by Mr. Llewellyn Thomas in his book *God and my Birthright*, and by the Rev. James Mountain, D.D., in *British-Israel Truth Defended*. To these able and exhaustive works the student is referred for complete treatment of the questions involved, as it would be unnecessary and impertinent for a later writer to attempt to cover the same field in the same microscopic and painstaking manner. All that is necessary is to give a brief *résumé* of the argument, adding here and there one or two observations of our own which have occurred to us during the perusal of the learned but most interesting productions to which we have referred.

In attempting to elucidate these prophecies the first point to be noted is that their fulfilment is continually associated with “ the latter days.” This phrase or its exact verbal equivalent is of constant occurrence in such passages as we shall have occasion to refer to. And on the basis of this fact the opponents of our theory erect two fortresses whose lines of fire tend rather to their mutual destruction. First “ the latter days ” are held merely to mean future days, any future days, provided, of course, that they do not happen to be those particular future days the adoption of which would

finally establish the British-Israel position. Secondly, "the latter days" refer exclusively to the millennium.

As we have already indicated, we are not personally inclined to reject the suggestion that prophecy may have its fulfilment not merely in one series of events, but in recurring cycles of events. We are not prepared to state dogmatically that Anti-Christ has not appeared as Nero, and as the Papacy, and that he has not still to appear. Always remembering however that the Papacy has been proved to fulfil the prophetic conditions in regard to time and to many other circumstances. As we have said previously, if we are morally bound to accept one line of prophetic thought only we feel intellectually bound to accept the Historic. Granted greater liberty than this, we think that investigators of all three schools are engaged in the examination of three different great divine cycles, and that their work is not antagonistic but mutually complementary. It seems to be obvious that when our Lord was approached by His disciples with the question, "Master, when therefore shall these things be?" His reply covered two events, the one the end of the times of the Jews, the other the end of the times of the Gentiles. The former had its fulfilment when Jerusalem was taken and the Temple destroyed. The latter may relate to our own era. One prophetic passage may therefore have two fulfilments in actual fact. We think the fulfilment may sometimes conceivably be threefold, as in the above-mentioned problem of the Anti-Christ. We are not therefore personally biased against a theoretic speculation that "the latter times" might conceivably refer to parallel events in (1) times merely future at the date of the giving of the prediction, (2) times post-Advent, and (3) times immediately pre-millennial. These however are simply our own views of the subject, and they must be brought to the definite test of Scriptural enlightenment.

It is to be noted that as regards any Scriptural problem that may engage our attention there is customarily, out of the many passages referring thereto, one in particular which is the passage of full revelation, and all other Scriptural references to the same problem are to be read in the light

of that one utterance. The passage of the full revelation in relation to the "latter times" is that previously cited from Isaiah ix, 1, in which it is clearly indicated that these times lie between the two advents of Christ—that they are the times in which we now live. The association of these "times" with the *birth* of Christ settles this for all reasonable minds. This central fact once clearly apprehended, we do no violence to sound argument in admitting that there may have been partial fulfilment of divine prediction in a previous time, which was merely future at the date of utterance. Thus, when Israel told his sons what was to be their fate in "the latter days" (Genesis xlix) one perfectly sound exegesis may consist in reading the expression as "future days." The early experiences of the tribes of Levi and Simeon go to prove this,* and also that of Joseph, to which tribe was promised marked fecundity. At the enumeration of Israel recorded in Numbers i, we find Judah to be the most populous clan, with a fighting strength of 74,600 men. Joseph comes next, with 72,700. But in the second enumeration of Numbers xxvi, though Judah now numbers 76,500, Joseph can muster 85,200, and is decidedly the preponderant house. And, given whole-hearted obedience to God, this state of affairs would have been continuous, and the divine blessing have proved itself to be uninterrupted through days both "future" and days actually "latter." For the understanding of that aspect of prophecy which may be included under the former term we may turn to the prophet Jeremiah. In Jeremiah iv, 10, there is a startling passage in which the prophet, heart-stricken at his country's griefs, positively accuses the Almighty of falsehood. "Ah, Lord God! surely thou has greatly deceived this people, saying, Ye shall have peace; whereas the sword reacheth unto the soul." "She hath been rebellious against me," was the Lord's reply. "Thy ways and thy doings have procured these things unto thee." And in xviii, 9, 10, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of

* See *The Whole Tithe*, p. 74.

the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.” * When a promise of God has been made for “future” days then so soon as the fulfilment of that promise had begun it was intended in the Divine mind that that fulfilment should be continuous. This intention has often, has customarily, been thwarted by Israel’s declension into sin. This is where we prove the absolute truth of Arminianism. But no promise of God can utterly fail, and if Israel would not be blessed in “future” days, Israel should be blessed in the “latter” days. This is where the Almighty proves the absolute truth of Calvinism. That the “latter days” refer to times between the two advents of Christ Isaiah has shown, when he associates the period with the birth of Christ, proving them to be post-advent, and also speaks of increase of His peace, proving them to be pre-millennial. Between those who translate the phrase as “future” and “latter” there is therefore no essential contradiction. “Future and perpetual” would have covered both eras. And the blessings of the future would have been perpetual but for man’s sin, which postponed the merely “future” to the definitely “latter.”

This being the case, we may now indicate in what these blessings were noticeably to consist.

To Abraham (Genesis xii, xiii, xv, xvii, xxi, xxii) were the promises of the Land—an enormous extent of territory never yet occupied by Israel at any time in her history, though during the reign of Solomon it may have been largely tributary to that monarch; the Sceptre; the Gate of his enemies; the promise of being a Blessing to all the families of the Earth; and of Fecundity—seed as “the dust of the earth.”

“In Isaac shall thy seed be called” and the Birthright became Isaac’s, to whom was confirmed (Genesis xxvi) the promises of the Land; Fecundity; the seed a Blessing to the Earth.

Isaac had two sons, Esau and Jacob. Through his own

* Which passage is explanatory of every evil which has befallen our nation since the year 1845. But our punishments can only be remedial, and can never eventuate in the destruction of people or Empire.

hastiness of character, and in the determinate counsel of God, Esau forfeited his tremendous Birthright, which came to Jacob. To Jacob God again confirmed (Genesis xxviii, xxxv) the promises of the Land ; Fecundity ; the seed to be a Blessing ; the Sceptre.

In Genesis xlix, when Jacob calls his sons to hear the promises pertaining to the "latter days," we find that certain of these blessings were now to be finally appropriated by certain families of Israel. For instance, the Sceptre went to Judah, and the promise of particular fruitfulness to Joseph. These facts must be remembered for the interpretation of later prophecy. The Birthright was also bestowed definitely upon Joseph (1 Chron. v, 2). It may be convenient to note at this point that Ephraim assumed the undoubted leadership of the Northern Kingdom at a later date, and that Israel became divided between Ephraim-Israel and Judah-Israel. Concerning the fruitfulness of the people, the words of God to Jacob in Genesis xxv, 11, should be kept distinctly before our minds, "A nation, and a company of nations, shall be of thee." In Genesis xxix, 25, is the first indication of maritime power, for Joseph is to have the "blessings of the deep that lieth under."

Passing on to the Book of Numbers, in chapters xxiii and xxiv, we come to the prophecies of Balaam, some of which again are to have their fulfilment in "the latter days." This phrase is applied to the fourth prophecy, but Mr. Thomas holds it to be the key to all the preceding ones. Probably he is right, but in case there should be divergence of opinion on this point, we will assume that the expression covers the fourth only. This again wholly negatives the idea that the "latter days" are millennial, for the promises are of victory in war, not of rest in peace.

In Deuteronomy xxxiii, Moses, just before his death, foretells for Joseph (1) Vast increase of wealth ; (2) military success ; (3) Fecundity ; (4) Maritime blessing.

In 2 Samuel vii, 10, there occurs a most remarkable prophecy, given from God to David, by Nathan. It was bestowed at a time of profound peace and prosperity, when

"the king dwelt in his house, and the Lord had given him rest from all his enemies round about." Israel was in undisturbed occupancy of a large extent of the territory embraced in the Abrahamic promise of the Land. That was their original "place" and they were "planted" therein. But Nathan says to David, "Thus saith the Lord . . . I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, that they may dwell in their own place, and be moved no more." This does not refer to Palestine, for if so the promise of being "moved no more" has failed. Moreover, the grammatical construction is in the future, not "I have planted" but "I will plant," not "I have appointed a place" but "I will appoint a place." There is, therefore, a further promise of territory not embraced in the Abrahamic covenant, a place in which Israel shall remain for ever, and "be moved no more." Not even back into Palestine, for though a certain number of Israel will return to the Promised Land, they will only return voluntarily and representatively—"one of a city and two of a family." The nation will never return.

After the blow had fallen, and Israel had been driven forth from the land which they had polluted by their sins, the prophets Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, all speak of their being led to "the wilderness," concerning which word Cruden says "the Hebrew gives this name to all places that are not cultivated, but which are chiefly destined to the feeding of cattle, and on which trees grow wild." In other words, a "wilderness" might ultimately prove itself highly productive land, given the right type of owner. There is nothing in the Hebrew to indicate anything to the contrary. Finally, Isaiah and Jeremiah associate the place of their deportation to Islands of the West, far off from Palestine, as we have already shown in Chapter II.

To sum up, in the latter days Ephraim-Israel was to be populous (a nation and a company of nations), wealthy, of military and naval pre-eminence, possessing the "gates" of his enemies, living in a place of his own, in large islands North-West of Palestine, though far off from thence, in a

place originally well cultivatable, but not originally well-cultivated.

We may now deal with the puerile suggestion that Israel returned with Judah at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. A glance at the map reveals no geographical propinquity between the places of captivity of Israel and of the Jews respectively, and raises considerable doubts in one's mind as to the possibility of such reunion. The previous history of the two peoples raises a further doubt, and a most substantial one, as to the likelihood of reunion. The jealousy between Northern and Southern Israel had broken out on one occasion in the days of David himself. Countries lying thus side by side with different ideals and the same monarch tend to separation, as in the case of Norway and Sweden, and in that of Austro-Hungary. It must eventually be vital union or war. There was as near as possible war with Scotland just before the union which took place in 1707. What has happened in the recent history of Ireland is known to all. To get the background of Israelitish history one must recognise the constant rivalry between Judah with the Sceptre, and Ephraim with the Birthright. When Isaiah declared that at a future time "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim," he means that the chronic animosity of ages shall have been allayed. After the division of Israel between Rehoboam and Jeroboam there was continuous warfare between the two peoples, with one short interval of alliance. Centuries of previous history render it unlikely in the extreme that any union took place between these hitherto jealous neighbours. Thus there are difficulties geographical and psychological, and these of an urgent type. We have spoken of the differing ideals of the peoples. With all their idolatry Jewry had the Temple of God amongst them, and at times there was definite religious revival when the whole people turned to worship Jehovah. Never was this the case with Israel unitedly. The bull was the totem of Israel, and from the days of Jeroboam Israel erected the golden calf and turned to worship himself.

Moreover, the testimony of the Bible is as clear as that

of the present Chief Rabbi, who, as we have seen, traces the ancestry of the Jews from Judah, Benjamin, and some intermixture of Levi. Any slight infiltration of Judah by other tribes had occurred at a time prior to the era of the respective captivities. In 2 Kings xvii, 23, it is stated that "Israel was carried away out of their own land to Assyria, *unto this day.*" This book was written or compiled by Ezra after the return from Babylon, as was the case with the books of Chronicles. And in 1 Chron. v, 26, we again read that the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, had been carried captive ". . . to the river Gozan, *unto this day.*" These quotations would, we think, settle the point for any man capable of appreciating the value of evidence, for even if Ezra were merely the editor of an ancient volume he would not have permitted these passages to be reissued without proper editorial scrutiny, and such note as was requisite to indicate Israel's return, had it taken place. But should there still be lingering doubts, read carefully through the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and it will be clearly demonstrated that those who came back were all of the Babylonish Captivity, not the Assyrian, and that they are constantly referred to as "Judah, Benjamin, . . . the Levites."

Israel had been forcibly removed to a region which may be briefly but with sufficient accuracy described as Armenia. Now there are some of the opponents of the British-Israel school who have far too much wit to indite the customary piffle about a return of Israel with Judah in the times of Ezra, and the ten tribes never having been "lost" at all. They know that to do so is simply to play into our hands. They take another line. They agree with us that the tribes were definitely lost—in Armenia. They know from their own experience, and our personal experience entirely confirms this, that one usually finds one's spectacles in the place in which they were lost. From which fact they infer that the ten tribes will also be found in the place in which they were lost. But there is a vast deal of difference between a man's lenses, which, providentially, cannot start walking off on their own account, and a man's neighbours,

who can. Israel must now be a nation pre-eminent in arms, and that pre-eminence must have been increasing since 1702. If this has been the case with the Armenians we have overlooked the fact. We agree that Israel originally centred round Armenia—but Israel walked.

A famous passage from 2 Esdras xiii, 39-46, must be quoted in full : “ And whereas thou sawest that he gathered unto him another multitude that was peaceable ; these are the ten tribes, which were led away out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Salmaneser the king of the Assyrians led away captive, and he carried them away beyond the River, and they were carried into another land. But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might there keep their statutes, which they had not kept in their own land. And they entered by the narrow passages of the river Euphrates. For the Most High then wrought signs for them, and stayed the springs of the River, till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half, and the same region is called Arsareth. Then dwelt they there until the latter times.”

Concerning which quotation we desire to make two comments. Arsareth is usually in British-Israel works described as the country about the river Sereth. Perhaps the Israelites did decamp to the territory watered by that river on this their first trek. But the marginal note in the Revised Apocrypha is singularly illuminating. The Revisers call attention to the fact that Arsareth means “ another land,” and refer the reader to Deuteronomy xxix, 28. This chapter of Deuteronomy deals with the solemn covenant made with Israel in Moab, which covenant was additional to the one made in Horeb. And in the course of the narrative Israel is solemnly warned that disobedience and idolatry would entail the consequence that “ the Lord rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into *another land*.” The fact of the Revisers having concluded that the narrative of Esdras

is a fulfilment of the prophecy in Deuteronomy is at least interesting. Evidently the verbal rendering will reasonably bear that construction.

The second comment we have to make is simply this, that the words of Esdras do not present any geographical difficulty, nor do they wholly negative any statement of Josephus which we may quote at a later stage. One opponent of British-Israel Truth regards the passing of the Euphrates as a retracing of their steps on the part of Israel, not a procedure necessary for their northern advance, but such a procedure as should finally convince us that a northern advance never took place. We find it impossible to follow his reasoning. The river Euphrates has its rise in Armenia. The "narrow passages" of that river are thus the exact portion of the river which the Israelites would have to negotiate. We can find no contradiction between Esdras and the map, and we think that the map confirms Esdras. To the north the Israelites went. They crossed the Caucasus into Scythia, presumably through the pass which is to this day known by the name of "The Gates of Israel." The flight occurred probably in the year 608 B.C. Scythia is now part of Russia, and the Russian Archæological Society have discovered several Israelitish burying-places in the Crimea, some of the inscriptions, as we have previously stated, bearing date as late as A.D. 6. Herodotus, writing a century and a half after Israel had traversed "The Gates of Israel," said: "The Caucasus bounds on the western side the sea called the Caspian. On the east succeeds a plain in extent unbounded in the prospect." Here, according to the same authority, dwelt a people who were either Scythians by race or *had acquired their country by driving out the former Scythian inhabitants*. They were a people whose history carried them back a thousand years, or, in other words, to the date of the Exodus from Egypt, when "Israel became a nation in a single night." They were called the Massagetae. According to Major B. de W. Weldon there had been a breaking up of the tribes, Joseph having become the Getae, and settled on the Danube, Dan having become the Thyssa Getae, and the remaining tribes the

Massagetae, or "Mass of the Getae." The name Getae had been adopted "on the well-nigh universal principle that makes new colonists adopt the name of their new country." * To quote from Dr. Mountain: "There are many points of resemblance, but the emphatic point which connects the two nations is that the Scythians entered Europe at the very epoch, by the self-same route, and from the identical district of Asia, at, by, and from which journeyed the Israelites of Esdras."

By way of anticipating ethnological and linguistic objections to the suggestion that we are derived from the Israelites who displaced the original inhabitants of Scythia, we may call attention to the fact that the European Turk and the Magyars are descendants of two oriental peoples who, settling in Europe, have completely changed their facial type, and that here we have proof of what may be occasioned by some change of geographical position, given a sufficient period for the newer physical factors to complete their work. With regard to the question of language, it must be admitted that language is a good test of propinquity, but not of race. What had happened to the Jews' language after seventy years of Babylon? It had been prophesied that Israel would lose her identity. And had she retained her original tongue throughout her wanderings she would have retained her identity. Had the England of 600 A.D. been found to be a Hebrew-speaking land this would have been proof of one of two alternatives, either that the English were Israel, and had always been known as such, or that the country had at some time been overrun by Hebrew-speaking Jews, who had caused the remaining peoples to adopt their tongue. Now Israel was to be lost, and even her language was to bear no more evidence of her origin than was inevitable. Such inevitable evidence is found in the fact that the English language contains four thousand Hebrew words, derived from eight hundred Hebrew roots. My authority for the words is Canon Lyson, and for the roots Max Müller.

Concerning the wanderings of the Israelites, one very fascinating theory has been worked out by Major B. de W.

* See *The Origin of the English*. (Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd.)

Weldon, the truth of which we must leave to others to determine. This theory was derived from a study of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and Daniel's interpretation of the prophecy unfolded in that vision.

Nebuchadnezzar had dreamt of an image whose head was gold, his breast and arms of silver, his belly and thighs of brass, his legs of iron, and his feet part of iron and part of clay. A stone was "cut out without hands." This stone "smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces." We particularly ask the readers' attention to the next verse (Daniel ii, 35), "then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken *in pieces together*," and also to verse 45, "it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the silver, and the gold." As regards the stone, it was said "in the days of *those kings* shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom—it shall break in pieces and consume *all these kingdoms*."

It is customary for the reader to peruse the above passages in the light of our present knowledge. Aware of the fact that the last or Roman Empire split up into ten kingdoms, we assume that the impact of the stone occurred at the era of the Church, and thus upon the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image. The stone therefore was the Church. A careless reading of the narrative finds its outcome in this rather plausible exegesis.

Now the interpretation was given to Nebuchadnezzar, and we must, therefore, look at the problem from the standpoint as revealed to him. It was not revealed to him that the "last king" should be split up into "ten kings." The "those kings" of verse 44 does not refer to the "ten kings." (We may meekly add that when the Church was established the Roman Empire was in the enjoyment of full power and dominance, and the times of the splitting up into ten toes, therefore, still future.) It is true that the Romish Church, successor in authority and in autocratic spirit to the Roman Empire, did attempt to subdue the "ten kings" to herself, but she can hardly be said to have broken them "so that they became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors." If any man thinks that the

“stone” is Roman Catholicism, we leave him to his thoughts. And if it be not the Roman Church, no other Church has ever attempted the complete subjugation of the territory once comprised in the Roman Empire.

The expression “those kings” in verse 44 can, therefore, only refer to the “kings” whose existence, present or future, had in previous verses been revealed to Nebuchadnezzar by the prophet. The first of “those kings” was Nebuchadnezzar’s own kingdom. “Thou art the head of gold.” “Those kings” are the Chaldean, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman Empires. They were earthly kingdoms, typified by a material object—the metallic image. The “kingdom” which destroyed them was also, therefore, a kingdom on earth, typified by a material object—a stone. But if it was to be set up in the days of “those kings,” it must have had its beginnings in the days of the Chaldean Empire, and, from the wording of verse 45, must apparently have borne its share in breaking up each successive Empire as the time for its departure arrived. Eventually, it would overspread the whole earth. Does the reader realise that the British Empire is, in extent and population, infinitely larger than any Empire of Nebuchadnezzar’s image? And is it not probable, is it not inevitable, that such an Empire must have met with some reference in Holy Writ?

There we leave a much controverted subject. The suggestion that Israel had its part in the breaking up of each successive world empire is Weldon’s theory, to which we have made allusion. If any one who honours us by reading these pages still holds to the view that the stone kingdom is purely spiritual, we ask him to again peruse our own feeble attempts to deal with the problem, and then to read the second chapter of Daniel, word by word, giving each phrase its full value, and eliminating from his mind all ideas that could not have been present in the mind of the original auditor—Nebuchadnezzar.

And this task having been duly performed, let us pass on to the fourth chapter of the same book. The subject dealt with is a terrible experience which befell this same Nebuchadnezzar. He had again to avail himself of Daniel’s

God-given skill to interpret for him a dream. Daniel informed him that the subject of the entire vision was himself, and that the vision was a prophecy that his pride and tyranny would bring on him a chastisement lasting for "seven times." The prophet closed on a hopeful note. "Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor; if there may be an healing of thine error." He had "time," in the most literal sense, given him for self-examination and self-correction (iv, 29). But it was unavailing. The sight of great Babylon was the occasion of a vehement outburst of that pride which goes before a fall. His reason departed, and for "seven times" he was an outcast from men (iv, 32). A stern warning of a seven times punishment was followed by a literal fulfilment, in the case of this particular sinning man. It is the foundation of our case that a stern warning of a seven times punishment was followed by a literal fulfilment, in the case of both branches of a particular sinning nation. It is our belief that one passage of Scripture is intended to cast light on another of a precisely identical nature, and that it argues no foolish credulity to recognise the parallelism between a man's punishment and a nation's punishment. When God solemnly pronounced the seven times tribulation incurred by this proud and stiff-necked monarch, the sentence did not assume a form which might, as regards its duration, mean anything or nothing. It was a 2520 days sentence. And the punishment of Israel did not mean, in its duration, anything or nothing. It meant 2520 years from start to finish, no more and no less. Only, Israel having definitely separated into north and south, and the punishment having, as all men know, begun in the case of Ephraim-Israel much before that of Judah-Israel, it must have ended much before it. If you believe the Bible to be the Word of God, we do not know by what logical process you escape our conclusions. If you believe it to be merely a conglomeration of more or less respectable ideas about theology mixed up with a good deal of doubtful history, we do not quite know why you are reading this book.

Now, let us pause here to think the matter over. It may

be taken that the class of person for whom we are principally writing is the thoughtful individual who is a believer in the Bible, no modernist or higher critic, not one of those who accept as much of the Scriptures as they have a mind to, rejecting the remainder, but a sincere student of the sacred pages. He has difficulties with his Bible, and honestly admits the fact. The only being who would meet with no difficulties therein is the man who has attained to all knowledge, and such a being does not exist. If this Book is worthy of a God, it will not be wholly understood by any single man. Nor by any group of men, however learned and extensive. The difference between the higher critic and the devout believer is mainly this, that, faced by the same problem, the higher critic cackles loudly over another Biblical error, while the believer simply waits for more light. With the result that, as the years pass on, the former has had to retreat from position after position, whilst the latter has had more and more occasion to thank God that he is standing within the protection of an impregnable fortress.

Now, here we have our friend faced with a new Biblical problem. An Oriental nation has sinned against Jehovah, and been placed under a ban for 2500 years and more. Wonderful promises of future greatness had been made to this people, and, on the expiration of the term of chastisement, these promises all begin to be fulfilled in the experience of an Occidental nation, found in quite another portion of the globe from that in which the delinquents were lost. On this evidence, is he, as a believer in the inerrancy of the Scriptures, called upon to believe that the English are Israel, whether they are or they are not ?

To the question as addressed to us *in that form*, the reply can only be a flat negative. Never palter with your sense of truth, and never force yourself to accept as true that which in your heart of hearts you believe to be untrue. You might do yourself serious mental damage in that way. The mind is a delicate organ requiring gentle handling. Firm handling, perhaps, but gentle. But modern psychology teaches us that such acute problems as are caused by

actual belief going one way, and conscience urging the acceptance of a pseudo-belief which goes entirely another way, are harmless when faced and dragged into the light. It is only when they burrow in the sub-conscious that they form the harmful complex. Get on to your knees before your Maker, lay the whole case before Him, and quietly await further guidance. Keep an honestly open mind upon the question, and do not improperly attempt to hasten a decision which is best arrived at deliberately. We write in this strain because, though we personally accept the British-Israel position and regard their case as reasonably proved at all points, we wholly refuse to attempt unfairly to dominate another man's mind as regards this question. We should consider it an honour to give direction to his thought. We should consider it a disaster to compel his thought. In this matter we shall consider it a happy event if we can display a reasonableness and a courtesy of which our opponents seem to know too little. Sometimes one meets with a man who, from Biblical testimony, has a strong suspicion that the British are the descendants of lost Israel, but, nevertheless, finds "his whole soul in revolt against the idea." Such an expression has actually been used in our experience. When a man finds his whole soul revolting against an idea, there must be a psychological cause, adequate or otherwise, to account for the revolt. The ultimate cause is in the majority of such cases, so far as British-Israel Truth is concerned, to be found in the fact that when a boy at school not one of his history books even remotely hinted at our Israelitish origin. Their contents may not have wholly negatived the idea, but silence seems negation. The theory, casually met with in middle age, clashes with the mental resultant of this silence of the primer. Hence the conflict. In his heart of hearts he believes that he is being compelled, on Biblical testimony, to accept something which is simply untrue, on historical, ethnological, and linguistic testimony.

Nothing actually contained in the Holy Scriptures will ever be found to be in ultimate conflict with the final pronouncement of any branch of science, historical, ethno-

logical, linguistic, or other. When Bible and Science contradict one another, we have either misread our Bibles, or Science has not said its last word.

The Bible clearly shows that Israel was to be chastised and to be lost, for an immense period of time. The loss of her identity clearly necessitates change of language. There are Biblical passages which seem to point to this, and in the nature of things it must be so. Under the circumstances, our four thousand Hebrew words, many of them "common words and names of familiar objects," are as complete a testimony of origin as we could expect. With the ethnological difficulty we have dealt. Decided change of location has been found to bring about decided alteration in appearance. With regard to any historical query that may remain, we must not magnify our difficulty, if difficulty there be. When Israel dwelt in Palestine she lived in walled cities, which are now being uncovered by the archaeologist to the great confusion of the higher critic. When she had been flung out of Palestine and became a wanderer, this type of evidence naturally fails us. What is left of a wattle-and-daub hut twenty years after occupancy? Gravestones are of more solid construction than temporary tenements, and in the Crimea such gravestones have been found. Israel got into Europe, and that undoubtedly. We think that the same God Who led her from Egypt to Palestine, and from Palestine to the Crimea, could and did lead her from the Crimea to the promised "Isles of the North-West." When we find that prophecy after prophecy given to Israel is fulfilled to England, and at the exact period in history when such fulfilment must materialise in solid fact, we are compelled to infer the extreme probability of our Crimean origin.

That our ancestors had come from a district "east of the Araxes"—one of the very districts of Israel's captivity—was the thesis put forward, years before British-Israel Truth was ever heard of, by Sharon Turner, a scholarly solicitor who was born in London in 1768, and died there in 1847. It is a little difficult to get any full details of his career, but Chambers's Encyclopædia gives him a paragraph in

which it is stated that "the intervals of a busy life he gave to hard reading and patient collection of materials, and he published a meritorious *History of the Anglo-Saxons* (1799-1805)." From the fact of his having enjoyed a pension of £300 during the last years of his life it would appear that his contemporaries thought highly of him. Sir Edmund Gosse speaks of him as "a careful imitator of Gibbon, who illustrated the Anglo-Saxon period of our chronicles." And Lord Macaulay refers to Turner's *History* as an authority consulted by him in his researches concerning Sedgemoor.

One error of the history books whose deficient information sowed the seeds of future mental perturbation may be dealt with now, and to finality. We used to be told that our island had been peopled by different races, and that the diffusion of their diverse characteristics amongst the resultant progeny had led to the formation of a strong, stable, and valorous race of colonists, and all the rest of it. The results of intermingling of different peoples does not usually lead to the formation of a "strong, stable, and valorous race." It customarily finds its fulfilment in the propagation of the less pleasing traits of the two parents, "poor white trash" in fact. And if we have enjoyed a considerable measure of the most solid success in our national life, if as colonists and governors, as engineers, and pioneers, we have left indelible marks upon the earth and its peoples, this result has not been attained through a heredity of mixed races, but through an intermingling of slightly divergent peoples of one race. Professor Huxley has stated that "All the detachments who flowed into Britain are branches of the self-same stock." And Professor Freeman, in his *Origin of the English Nation*, has the following passage: "Tribe after tribe, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Frisians, poured across the sea to make new homes in the Isle of Britain. Thus grew up the English nation—a nation formed by the union of various tribes of the same stock. The Dane hardly needed assimilation; he was another *kindred* tribe, coming later than the others. Even the Norman was a *kinsman*." We could quote further evidence of the same type, were it necessary.

We are inclined to venture the remark that the whole of Israel, rather obviously, did not take up its residence in Britain, and that it is incumbent upon us to cultivate the warm friendship of the Swedish, Norwegian, Danish and Dutch peoples. The Germans, as shown in Chapter II, are not of our kin. Comparing history with prophecy, we are driven to the conclusion that in Britain itself Ephraim must be the predominant tribe.*

To conclude, at the very period of the end of the Seven Times chastisement we find England enjoying all the blessings of fecundity, military and naval prowess, wealth, and so forth, which were promised to Ephraim-Israel. Particularly does she *at this time* become a blessing to other peoples, through the missionaries and governors whom she sends out to their assistance. She is living in a place of her own, in islands north-west of Palestine, and "far off." She has completely lost all suspicion as to her identity with Israel, but uses 4,000 Hebrew words in her speech—words derived obviously from Hebrew roots, to put it a little more accurately. She has begun to find the place too small for her, also in accordance with the very words of prophecy, but sends out colonists, and thus becomes not only a nation but a company of nations. Time and circumstance conjoin in declaring England to be Israel. We know definitely that Israel reached the south of Russia, by the shores of the Black Sea. We are compelled to suspect that Sharon Turner was right in his contention, and that she exchanged the Black Sea for the North.

Josephus is clear in his testimony as to Israel's never having returned to Judah. "There are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude." At the time at which he wrote they were rather considerably beyond the Euphrates, but the statement is true so far as it goes. The Israelites themselves had gone farther.

* Some British-Israelites hold that the whole of the true Israelitish stock ultimately found their habitat in Britain only. Though we personally do not hold this view, it is fair to call attention to it.

They had proceeded, though all unknowingly, under the guidance of God to their final goal. We are completely in agreement with Canon Kingsley, when we find him asking, "Was there no one mind to lead these innumerable armies, on whose success depended the future of the whole human race? Did no one marshal them in that impregnable convex front, from the Black Sea to the North Sea? Did no one guide them to the two great strategic centres of the Black Forest and Trieste? No one cause them, blind barbarians without maps or science, to follow those rules of war without which victory in a protracted struggle is impossible? And by the pressure of the Huns behind, force on their flagging myriads to an enterprise which their simplicity fancied at first beyond the powers of mortal man?" For the second time He had brought His people into a Promised Land, into the possession of the Appointed Place.

But, say our opponents, the Appointed Place of Israel is, and always has been, Palestine, and the words "I will appoint a place" are merely a mistranslation. Correctly rendered they read "I have appointed a place."

All sound Hebraists seem to agree that the passage requires such a rendering as the customary translations supply. A very interesting reference to this fact occurred in the *National Message and Banner* for May 28, 1927. It appears that Dr. Moffatt had been approached to see if it were possible to change the text into the past tense, because "the future tense places a weapon in the hands of those who believe in the Israelitish origin of the British people." Unfortunately for those who would prefer a past tense rendering, the Doctor replied, "I had no hesitation in rendering the tense future. Grammatically, this seems certain."

And Moffatt is the man whom even the *Jewish Chronicle* admitted "had clearly proved the soundness of his knowledge of Hebrew."

CHAPTER IV.

THE THIRD DAY : THE LOLLARDS.

“ The third day he will raise us up.”—*Hosea vi, 2.*

COMING events cast their shadows before. If after 1702 the British Empire built itself up upon the face of the earth as no Empire, no, not even any Empire typified in Nebuchadnezzar's image, had ever succeeded in doing, the building must have been erected on a previously existent foundation. We seem to require a period of increasing Divine favour previous to His full acceptance, to prepare the way for the further blessing He designed to pour out after the lapse of the Seven Times. There is prophetic indication that there was to be such a period. Between the conquest of disease and the enjoyment of full health occurs the period of convalescence, one apt to be particularly trying both to the patient and his attendants. Now, we are not going to extract from the words of Holy Writ anything that is not fairly to be found therein, but we do think that all serious Biblical students hold the Old Book to be one compilation, complete in itself, and in harmony with itself throughout, a view which a careful perusal of McCormack's *Heptadic Structure* will wonderfully tend to confirm. To be brief, it is not a coincidence that the Book begins with a garden, and ends with a Garden City, and it is highly probable that we might find something dimly set forth by Hosea much elucidated by St. Peter.

Hosea was particularly a prophet to Israel, and to them he said, “ After two days will He revive us ; on the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him.” These are obviously not literal days, nor are they prophetic years, for the time is too short. When St. Peter tells us that “ one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and

a thousand years as one day," we have found the key. It unlocks a door which swings widely open, much more widely than we supposed previously to giving months of study to the subject. (Definitely to ascertain that Hosea and Lord Macaulay have said each the same thing, each in his own way, is indeed startling). The very end and aim of prophecy is that it shall be understood by the right people at the right time, and therefore Hosea's optimistic but baffling utterance must have its solution somewhere in Holy Writ. And this is the only possible solution. The right time we take to be these present days when prophecy is being so rapidly fulfilled, and the right people such persons as Major B. de W. Weldon, Llewellyn Thomas, and others who, deeply desiring to honour God by the unveiling of the prophetic Scriptures, have found in St. Peter the elucidatory authority on this particular matter. We therefore believe that God commenced His work of "raising up" 2,000 years after that of tearing down. And the facts substantiate our faith.

Our starting points are 741, 721, and 676 B.C., and our period 2,000 years. Taking the solar year as $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, the ancient solar as 360, and the lunar as 354, this gives us a series of dates of fulfilment which runs as follows :—1198, 1218, 1231, 1251, 1260, 1263, 1280, 1296, and 1325 A.D. Of these the solar dates are 1260, 1280, and 1325. The inference, which is most directly borne out by the history of our country, is that the beginnings of the revival, the dawn of the third day, are to be found in an era starting in the year 1198 and ending in 1325. * Prior to 1198 is the darkness of God's displeasure. Between 1198 and 1325 must come gradually increasing marks of God's favour. By the time that 1325 is reached something must have occurred which presages in a marked fashion the certainty of continued and greater blessing; something, perhaps many things, which prepared the way for that complete dispersion of the Divine wrath upon Israel which was to disappear finally in a later era, that dating from 1702 to

* If Francis Bacon is the father of modern science that stupendous man Roger Bacon was the grandfather. He was born at Ilchester in 1214 and died at Oxford in 1294. We trace our university system from the thirteenth century.

1845, and more particularly, we think, from 1702 to 1800.

That this was actually the case is a fact known to all students of English History, and a fact which has been most conveniently summarised by Lord Macaulay who most emphatically had no prophetic case to prove. His *History of England* was published in 1848, and in the famous Third Chapter there occurs a passage which we quote, and a few words of which we italicise. "It can easily be proved that, in our own land, the national wealth has, *during at least six centuries*, been almost uninterruptedly increasing; that it was greater under the Tudors than under the Plantagenets; that it was greater under the Stuarts than under the Tudors; that, in spite of battles, sieges, and confiscations, it was greater on the day of the Restoration than on the day when the Long Parliament met; that in spite of maladministration, of extravagance, of public bankruptcy, of two costly and unsuccessful wars, of the pestilence and of the fire, it was greater on the day of the death of Charles the Second than on the day of his Restoration. This progress, having continued during many ages, became at length, *about the middle of the eighteenth century*, portentously rapid, and has proceeded, during the nineteenth, with accelerated velocity."

But if coming events cast their shadows before, there is another proverbial saying to the effect that it's the darkest hour before the dawn. So it seems to have been in England. For our country appears to have reached its lowest during the period between Stephen's accession in 1135, and de Montfort's rebellion in 1265. Stephen's reign was not so much a reign as a nightmare. "It was a terrible time for the English; trade and agriculture were ruined, and it was said that God and His saints were asleep, so terrible were the wrongs which were done in the land." After Stephen, Henry II., a much stronger man, a ruler of great natural powers, but of so hasty and passionate a disposition, that the results of his years of clear thinking were ruined by his moments of stormy anger. So far as is essential for our purpose, it is only necessary to refer to the Becket incident.

Through sheer ability, Thomas Becket, Archdeacon of Canterbury, had been made Chancellor, and had rendered the Crown great service, particularly in the matter of scutage, or the commuting of personal service for payment in money. This reform relieved the subject of an onerous burden, whilst automatically replenishing the Treasury. In due time the Archdeacon received his reward by receiving the Archbishopric. The Archdeacon had a head. The Archbishop a swollen head. Hence the trouble.

At that time ecclesiastics charged with crime were tried before the ecclesiastical courts, not the civil. There were seven orders of clergy, which meant that nearly every professional man who was not a soldier was somehow or other a clergyman. But the ecclesiastical courts could not inflict the death penalty. They could only unfrock. Hence the saying that it took one murder to hang a layman, two murders to hang a cleric. Henry made the reasonable proposition that ecclesiastics should be tried before their own courts, but in the presence of a King's Officer, who, on conviction and unfrocking, should there and then attach the person of the criminous clerk, and deal with his vile carcase as though he were an ordinary sinner. This most righteous reform was at first accepted by Becket, who, however, subsequently withdrew the acceptance, and hurried off to appeal to the Pope. The struggle continued for six years, and the question was not placed on a settled basis even at the time of Becket's return to England in 1169.

During his absence Henry had desired to have his eldest son crowned in his own lifetime, after the Continental fashion. This had been done by Becket's rival, Roger, Archbishop of York. Becket's first act on his return was to excommunicate Roger and the bishops of the King's party. This was defiance of the most determined and deadly type. Henceforth the church must be cudgelled into due subservience to lawful authority, or snap its fingers at all authority. Save that the cudgelling should have been after a lawful and constitutional fashion. A momentary explosion of the King's wrath flung away the whole advantage which the proud and obstinate Prelate had placed

in his hands. "Are there none of the cowards eating my bread who will rid me of this turbulent priest?" he roared. Four knights hurried to Canterbury. The design was arrest. The outcome was murder, and within the Cathedral itself. The result was the abasement of the King, who knelt before the shrine, four years later, to be scourged by the clergy assembled for this welcome purpose. For by this time Becket was hailed as martyr and saint. His shrine was the favourite place of Israel's idolatry until another Henry dealt with the matter finally. In the meantime, the wrong cause had been endowed with the right colour, and a crime-laden church triumphed over an angry monarch. The position of Rome received an enormous access of strength.

Henry II was followed by Richard I, a violent persecutor of the Jews, and a mono-maniac. The mania took the Crusading form. The ten years of his reign consisted of six months spent in England attending more or less to his own business, and the rest of the time spent elsewhere attending to other people's business. The debt which all men owe to him consists in the fact that he inspired Sir Walter Scott to write some rare chapters. And after all this debt seems to be due to Scott. We refer to *Ivanhoe*, not to *The Talisman*.

John, who succeeded him, is chiefly known to schoolboys as the gentleman who lost his clothes in the Wash. To Englishmen, as the man who, in 1213, consented to hold England as a fief of the Papacy, and to pay the Pope 1,000 marks for the privilege of doing so. Could we have descended to much lower depths than this? Apparently we could, for at the end of his reign things were in such a state of chaos in the country that the barons offered the Crown to Louis, eldest son of Philip of France, and we narrowly escaped a second degradation—that of being an appanage of a continental power.

But we have previously noted that the first faint glimmerings of dawn for Israel might have been expected just after the year 1198. John came to the throne in 1199. He was one of those persons, James II being another, who

was destined to be what we may term a negative blessing to the nation. Just as the misdeeds of James II resulted in the Bill of Rights so did the folly of John issue in Magna Charta, in the year 1215. Once again must we have resource to Macaulay. "England fell (in 1199) under the dominion of a trifler and a coward. *From that moment her prospects brightened.* . . . The great grandsons of those who had fought under William and the great grandsons of those who had fought under Harold began to draw near to each other in friendship; and the first pledge of their reconciliation was the Great Charter, won by their united exertions. . . . *Here commences the history of the English nation.*" The italics, as before, are our own. The historian goes on to note that it is in the annals of the thirteenth century that "we must seek for the origin of our freedom, our prosperity, and our glory."

John died, his heir was only in his tenth year, it naturally took time for a new royal and loyal party to be formed, and Louis' forces, military and naval, were not finally overthrown until the battles of Lincoln Fair and Sandwich in 1217. At the latter Hubert de Burgh, in command of a fleet of forty English vessels, tackled the French Fleet of eighty ships, got to windward, grappled, and made use of the wind to scatter quicklime. The French—such as were left of them—retired in floods of tears. But not many were left. Shock tactics and English bowmen had done their work. And thus began the fifty-six years' reign of Henry III. Prior to its conclusion events had taken place which were of the first import as regards the future stability of our nation, but these late reforms were necessitated by earlier evils. How soon after 1198 had the Almighty been pleased to confer a "blessing of the deep" the battle of Sandwich proves.

The thousand marks which, annually remitted to Rome, periodically reminded our forefathers of their new condition of servitude, were a sweet morsel in the mouth of the Papal Treasury. Much will have more, and the English cow gave good milk. Here was a new source of supply. The source might be developed a little. His Holiness

considered that it would be an excellent idea that the clergy and laity of these realms should contribute a proportion of their incomes to the support of the Papal Court. The clergy grumbled and paid—one-tenth of their incomes and the whole first year's income of all benefices, annates and first-fruits. The laity did not grumble—because they had blankly refused to pay. Rome also provided for the emoluments of her immediate servants by granting foreigners necessarily resident abroad the emoluments of livings situated in England. This was called provisors or provisions, and a very good name for it. The scheme was unpopular in this country.

Furthermore, though we had been delivered from the danger of descending to the level of a fief of France, we were only about to experience what can be done by the guileless and artless foreigner when he gets a footing at court.

Peter des Roches, the King's favourite, was surrounded by a group of greedy Poitevins. The favour shown to these people and the substantial forms in which that favour found its happy expression very nearly brought the country to civil war. The Poitevins were dismissed, and retired to live on the proceeds. The horse-leech, however, had *two* daughters, and, as in ancient days, they still cried "give, give." For the Poitevins were merely succeeded by the Provençals, who came over with Queen Eleanor. Finally, the Poitevins came back with Henry's half-brothers. Furthermore, the King fell badly in debt to the Pope. The nation made no craven submission to this process of blood-sucking, but the machinery of government was wholly inadequate to its task. No means lay to the people's hand for the immediate voicing of grievances. The opposition eventually centred itself in Simon de Montfort, and though his rebellion ended in his death, the failure was only apparent, whilst the triumph was actual. For the results of the rising were threefold. (1) Here endeth the chapter of the foreign favourite, and for ever; (2) the era of the Pope's interference as overlord is finished with; and (3) from this time forward a Parliament thoroughly representative of the whole nation, a Parliament to which the ministry should be directly

responsible, was the ideal at which statesmen aimed. They saw the way long before they had been able to take many steps thereupon. De Montfort's Parliament marks the dividing line between a horribly bad age, when England had lain in the dust for Pope and Frenchman to trample upon, and a much better age when the country increased in internal resources, in domestic freedom, in self-reliance, and in international prestige. Its date is 1265.

Henry III was succeeded by Edward I, the first king of England who had the shrewdness to use Parliament as a means of government. His predecessors had invariably looked upon each such assembly as a diminution of their power. But he had completed a master-stroke of policy before his first Parliament had assembled.

It cannot be too clearly realised that the commercial greatness of England dug its strong and continuing foundations at this period. It could not have dug any foundation whatsoever if it had not had a spade to dig with, and that spade was a sheep, if we may be permitted an illuminating but unusual mixture of metaphor and fact. The sheep has been the best friend this country has ever had. (At times it has appeared to be the worst enemy, and this point we may discuss subsequently.) The fleeces of England were to earlier ages what the coal of England has been to later. Both provided an outward freight. In the ordinary way of trade, both ensured an inward freight. To take an apposite quotation: "To Bordeaux came the merchandise of all the fair countries which are watered by the Garonne and the Dordogne—the cloths of the south, the skins of Guienne, the wines of the Medoc, to be borne away to Hull, Exeter, Dartmouth, Bristol, or Chester, in exchange for the wools and woolfels of England." We have had the whip-hand of the nations. In the case both of wool and coal we supplied an article which we alone could export, which foreign peoples must take, and of which they must pay for the taking. As regards our flocks, the Continental nations foolishly played into our hands. Writing upon this matter a modern economist has said: "It is generally admitted that the early development of England was due to the amount and

excellence of her *wool*. English wool was required by the more advanced nations, and was sent to Genoa and Venice and Flanders. This was probably due to the greater security of this island from marauding raiders and rapacious barons."

"It was this wool which for the most part supplied the lords with the means of paying their dues to the king. Its sale and transport were facilitated by the numerous fairs held in various parts of the country. The merchants who collected it were required to send it for export to certain specified towns, known as *staples*. Here the trade was regulated and the customs duties paid."

The provision of an island free "from marauding raiders" was the gift of God, as guarded by hefty-handed warriors. We had our farm, and our watch-dogs. All we wanted was uninterrupted commerce, for the continuous and certain utilisation of our produce. For, despite the necessities of other nations, such commerce had been intermittent, owing to trouble with powers foreign and foolish. When Edward I heard of his father's death he was abroad. Returning to England, he, on his way hither, made a treaty with the Count of Flanders relative to this very matter, securing continuity of trade, a treaty which was naturally of the utmost importance for "the greatest wool-growing country of the west of Europe."

For our present purpose we must regard the annexation of Wales as being one of the most important events of this reign, and we think the previously noted prophetic date of 1280 is intended to mark that event. However national susceptibilities may have been affected, it was an impossibility for two nations to inhabit the southern portion of one small island with different governments, different languages, different standards. Friction would be inevitable. At the time it may have appeared harsh, but ultimately it proved wise and kindly for this barrier to be broken down. It was a step in the consolidation of Britain. The matter was completed by grant of full parliamentary representation to Wales in the reign of Henry VIII.

There is a curious parallelism between this first era of blessing starting about 1198 and that era of fuller blessing

starting with 1702. Both eras had their commencement after a period of darkness and trouble. John admitted the Pope's overlordship. James II tried to bring us under the heel of Rome. After John we narrowly escaped vassalage to France. James II was a tool of France, and secretly in the pay of France, and the government of England was frequently but secretly dictated from the French Embassy. De Montfort's rebellion failed, but led definitely to increased national well-being. The Duke of Monmouth's rebellion failed, failed utterly, but the barbarities practised thereafter paved the way for William of Orange. Finally, if the annexation of Wales and the consequent further consolidation of Britain, marks the first era, the union with Scotland, and the final consolidation of Great Britain, stamps the second.

One further fact must be noted, as of great interest in our history as viewed from our present standpoint. Edward I's reign was marred by the expulsion of the Jews. This act seems to have been contrary to the personal wish of the sovereign, who was overborne. This expulsion added to the power of the Parliament, as it deprived the king of considerable revenue. Not till the days of Cromwell was this injustice remedied, and then very partially.

It is, of course, not our intention to follow the history of our country year by year from the beginning of the Third Day to the conclusion of the Seven Times, from 1198 to 1845. But it is due to a reasonably adequate treatment of our subject that we make some enquiry into the matter, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the history of the Motherland from 1198 to 1702 does not show forth a nation of increasing power and plenitude, and of an increasingly high standard of religious attainment ; and a further enquiry, relative to the years 1702 to 1845, in order that we may discern whether this period of the Third Day, as the chastisement finally dies away, does not reveal to us the same nation in a much more highly spiritual condition, with a strikingly larger and more rapid increase of worldly power, wealth, and prestige. As every schoolboy knows, the history of England is that, and precisely that. A flowing tide

sometimes seems to ebb, but the apparent ebb is momentary, and the flood certain. At isolated periods of our era of advance we seem to have made definite retrogression, but these periods were short ; and never to the permanent damage of the nation. Edward VI was succeeded by Mary and her Spanish husband. But what of Elizabeth and the Spanish Armada ? So far we have briefly portrayed the dark days before the dawn, from Stephen to de Montfort, when we were at our worst. Then comes a sudden turn, England freed from Popish overlord and foreign favourite, the beginnings of the modern Parliament, the first monarch who was possessed of sufficient wisdom to see the enormous value of Parliamentary government ; the annexation of Wales, and the wool-trade, the humble but adequate foundation of all our future commercial greatness, set on a stable basis. And all this just at the period indicated by Hosea the Prophet.

There are two matters on which we must linger just a little. The one concerns Wycliffe and the Lollards. The other has its foundation in the Black Death. Wycliffe was born in 1325, and seems in the period of earlier blessing to have filled a place in the Divine Scheme analogous, perhaps rather markedly so, to Wesley and his preachers in later days. The analogy is worth dwelling upon, and we return to it later.

The Black Death occurred in 1349, and, though a fearful visitation, it had vast after-effects in raising the standard of living for the common people—the “borel folk,” as they termed themselves. It had first appeared in China, reached Constantinople in 1347, and England two years later. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s description of its arrival is so highly poetic that we must transcribe it :—

“In the month of July of the year 1348, between the feasts of St. Benedict and of St. Swithin, a strange thing came upon England, for out of the east there drifted a monstrous cloud, purple and piled, heavy with evil, climbing slowly up the hushed heaven. In the shadow of that strange cloud the leaves drooped on the trees, the birds ceased their calling, and the cattle and the sheep gathered cowering

under the hedges. A gloom fell upon all the land, and men stood with their eyes upon the strange cloud, and a heaviness upon their hearts they crept into the churches, where the trembling people were blessed and shriven by the trembling priests. Outside no bird flew, and there came no rustling from the woods, nor any of the homely sounds of Nature. All was still, and nothing moved, save only the great cloud which rolled up and onward, with fold on fold from the black horizon. To the west was the light summer sky, to the east this brooding cloud-bank, creeping ever slowly across, until the last thin blue gleam faded away and the whole vast sweep of the heavens was one great leaden arch.

“Then the rain began to fall. All day it rained, and all the night and all the week and all the month, until folk had forgotten the blue heavens and the gleam of the sunshine. It was not heavy, but it was steady and cold and unceasing, so that the people were weary of its hissing and its splashing, with the slow drip from the eaves. . . . It was raining at Lammas-tide, and raining at the Feast of the Assumption, and still raining at Michaelmas. The crops and the hay, sodden and black, had rotted in the fields, for they were not worth the garnering. The sheep had died, and the calves also, so there was little to kill when Martinmas came and it was time to salt the meat for winter. They feared a famine, but it was worse than famine which was in store for them.

“For the rain had ceased at last, and a sickly autumn sun shone upon a land which was soaked and sodden with water. . . . It was as though the sick earth had burst into foul pustules; mildew and lichen mottled the walls, and with that filthy crop Death sprang also from the water-soaked earth. Men died, and women and children, the baron of the castle, the franklin on the farm, the monk in the abbey, and the villein in his wattle-and-daub cottage. . . . Of those who were stricken none recovered, and the illness was ever the same—gross boils, raving, and the black blotches which gave its name to the disease. All through the winter the dead rotted by the wayside for want of someone to bury them. In many a village no

single man was left alive. Then at last the spring came. . . . But only half of England could know it—the other half had passed away with the great purple cloud.

“Yet it was there, in that steam of death, in that reek of corruption, that the brighter and freer England was born. There in that dark hour the first streak of the new dawn was seen. For in no way save by a great upheaval and change could the nation break away from that iron feudal system which held her limbs. But now it was a new country which came out from that year of death. The barons were dead in swaths. No high turret or cunning moat could keep out that black commoner who struck them down. Oppressive laws slackened for want of those who could enforce them, and once slackened could never be enforced again. The labourer would be a slave no longer. The bondsman snapped his shackles. There was much to do and few left to do it. Therefore the few should be free men, name their own price, and work where and for whom they would. It was the Black Death which cleared the way for the great rising thirty years later which left the English peasant the free-est of his class in Europe.”

This quotation from *Sir Nigel* is a lengthy one. But when a man has done a piece of work perfectly and for all time, it seems better to steal that work wholesale than to botch the matter by attempting a feeble imitation of one's own. Oh! that Conan Doyle had stuck to his history and let Spiritism go its own way.

Other things worked together for eventual good in the formation of the English character at this period. The days of chivalry and all that they entailed had been tolerated whilst it had appeared that the knighthood of that age was really necessary to the defence of the realm. But at Crecy (1346) and at Poitiers (1356) stupendous victories, the latter against fourfold odds, had been gained by English yeomen against the power and chivalry of the Continent. The bowmen of England, officered by the gentlemen of England, had simply mown down the mail-clad gentry of France. “The proudest chivalry of the world had been unable to make headway against the weapons

of the disciplined peasants. *Power had changed hands.*" This set the peasant thinking. With his own weapons he was a better man than his own master. The arrow that clove French armour could pierce English armour. Hitherto his lord had protected him. Henceforth it seemed as though he must protect his lord. But the officer was still a necessity, also discipline, and both will be whilst the earth endures. A capacity to recognise this fact, a fact which every truly self-respecting man can bring his mind to the hearty acceptance of, leads to the discarding of the futile insurrections of the agitator, and issues in the steady onward march of an ordered democracy. To translate it into the terms of our own day, capital and labour are not in the nature of things hostile components of the State, but complementary. Working together, they can do for British industry what the knights and bowmen of England did for British prestige at Poitiers and Agincourt—easily annihilate an opposition fourfold or sevenfold.

But meanwhile the labourer was a serf, bound to the soil. He had his rights. Part of the tillage land of the manor was worked by the bailiff for the supply of the lord's granaries. The remainder was cultivated by the serfs for themselves. And the serf was not a slave. By custom he was free of the landlord's caprice, and evictions were rare. Sometimes he was able by years of hard work on his holding to purchase his freedom. The villeins were compelled to work for so many days a year on the lord's land, but gradually it had become the use to commute this service for a money payment, and, from the manorial rolls, it would appear that it often came about that a day's ploughing was commuted for a less sum than the lord would have to pay another man to plough. Thus indicating that the villein was even then a hedgehog whom no man cared to clutch too hard. "The peasant had grasped the conception of complete personal liberty, he held it degrading to perform forced labour, and he considered freedom to be his right."

Whilst matters were thus in the seething pot, there came

the Black Death. Half England perished, and before 1349 was out wages were doubled, to the great distress of the landlords. The Statute of Labourers was passed, a futile measure ordering that wages should remain as before, *and the price of foodstuffs also*. Then commenced a thirty years' battle between a farcical enactment and an economic fact, with the landlords and the peasants as pawns in the game, the latter side gaining all the time. The only persons who could enforce the Statute were the landlords. Let a landlord stand to his legal rights and offer the villeins the mere legal wage, and off they would go to a neighbouring bailiff who was willing to pay, not according to Parliamentary law, but according to economic law. The landlord could set the machinery of the law working, but meanwhile his crops were rotting. And anyway a prisoner in Winchester Gaol was not reaping the harvest of Hampshire.

A generation of bad feeling culminated in the Peasants' Rising of 1381. During all this time the labourer was getting more and more out of hand. Why shouldn't he? Providence and the Black Death had placed him in a position in which he could eventually assert his God-given right to freedom. In the days when he relied on the armour-clad lord for protection he could well afford to be humble. But in every churchyard in England grew the yew-stave, and on every marsh in England flew the grey-goose. And these had told their tale. Times were changing. If he could not yet do as he would, he would even now do as he could. And so Langland writes :—

“Labourers that have no land to live on but their hands
Deigned not to dine a-day on worts a night old.
Penny ale will not do nor a piece of bacon,
But if it be fresh flesh or fish fried or baked,
And that hot-and-hot for the chill of their maw.”

In 1381 the pot came to the boil. The last faggot on the fire causing the final rise of temperature was an unpopular poll-tax. The peasants of Essex rose under Jack Straw, and of Kent under Wat Tyler. All things went well with them till they wantonly destroyed the Hospital of the

Knights of St. John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell. Ancient writers on the sin of sacrilege have dwelt with much complacency on this fact. Wat Tyler was killed by Walworth, the Lord Mayor. The young king listened to the demands of the peasants, which were that customary services should be abolished, that the rent paid for the land in lieu of services should be fourpence per acre, and that the right of buying and selling in fairs and markets should be free to all. These demands the King granted. The peasants went home. The Parliament refused to ratify the royal grant. All seemed lost—but all had been gained. The labourer had given indication of his power, and no man wanted further trouble of a like nature. The Members of Parliament at Westminster might maintain the existence of the Statute of Labourers at Westminster, but it was quite another thing to enforce it ten miles away. This incident commences a century of great prosperity for the labourer, and never has he sunk subsequently to the level of the continental peasant. Always has he been free, often has he been prosperous. Once again came victory out of defeat. In reading our “rough island story,” one is over and over again struck by the oft times that a brave man lost his life, and gained his cause.

As it seems to be one of our pleasing and settled convictions that all traces of slavery in Great Britain were lost at an early age in her history, it is proper to point out that the last atom of serfage died out late in the eighteenth century, when the system of working the coal mines in Scotland by serf labour came to an end. *

Before we finish with the labourer, let us complete what we had to say with reference to the sheep. We have remarked that this animal is the greatest friend, economically, that this country has possessed, though it sometimes appeared to be its greatest enemy. We have endeavoured to say something upon the invaluable asset which wool has been to England in her foreign trade. Let us now add that so great were the profits of this commodity that too frequently have our landowners been tempted to

* Lord Rosebery would place the date even later still.

turn arable land into pasture, with the consequence that tens of thousands of agricultural labourers were thrown out of employment and driven into the towns where their labour was not required. Two waves of this type seem to have flowed over the country, the second embittering the last years of Henry VIII, for of the England of that date it was said that "it is a land where sheep eat men." And after the Black Death, when the peasantry had things so very much their own way, certain farmers saw their opportunity, increased their stock, and "turned their corn land into pasture, so that flocks of sheep, with perchance a single shepherd, wandered now where once a hundred men had work and wage."

In the period with which we are now dealing two factors were at work. The Black Death hastened the work of freeing men's bodies. Wycliffe began a labour which ended ultimately in freeing their souls. Here again we have apparent failure and ultimate success. The Church might disinter Wycliffe's bones for the purpose of burning them, though this seems a futility akin to that of hanging the dead Cromwell. But it could never entirely crush out the result of his labour. Generation after generation it went on, underground perhaps, but still there. When the time came for a final reckoning with Rome, a nucleus existed for men to gather round.

We have suggested an analogy between Wycliffe and Wesley. Both were of the same University. Both were translators of the New Testament—and Wesley's translation over and over again anticipates the findings of the Revisers. Both gathered round them a band of preachers, through whose labours England was indoctrinated with a more vital faith. Wesley found that to make men love God you must first make them sing.* So strongly had this fact impressed Wycliffe that his followers were called Lollards, from the word "lollen"—to sing. The early Wesley was a high churchman of the highest type, and the

*The choir at Wesley's Chapel in Newcastle was one of the finest in the country. The future Lords Stowell and Eldon often officiated as choristers therein.

later Wesley not altogether without leanings that way. "If the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them." Wycliffe's quarrels were quite as much with the lives of the churchmen as with the doctrines of the Church. If he were not a transubstantiationist he was a consubstantiationist, and, like Luther, thought that images in churches might be useful as tending to assist the ignorant in their worship, and therefore harmless if not themselves worshipped. In which judgment both Wycliffe and Luther showed a very surface understanding of the limitations of human nature. Wesley and Wycliffe were probably the ripest scholars of their respective ages, and men whose writings were eagerly sought after. They both wrote for their times, and an amazing consequence ensues. Wesley is clear to baldness, whilst Wycliffe is un-understandable. His era was steeped in Occam, and he therefore wrote in the jargon of the schools. It was his only chance then, and it gives him no chance now. We of course refer to his major works, and not to those tracts which he composed for the common people.

Moreover, there is between John Wycliffe and John Wesley a most interesting historical and spiritual connection, and one easily traced. John Huss came under the dominance of Wycliffe's writings, so much so that the latter may well be looked upon as his spiritual father. The Hussites divided themselves into two schools, the Utraquists and the Taborites. The latter disappear from history, but the former finally became merged in the Moravian Brethren. And it was through Wesley's contact with the Moravians, Peter Bohler and others, that his inward religious life became entirely changed; that he ceased to be a mere formalist and became a fervid vitalist. The ultimate sources of the Methodist Revival are therefore to be found, not in Zinzendorf and Germany, not in Huss and Bohemia, but in Wycliffe and England.

When God has a great work to be done He always chooses a great scholar to do it. Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. St. Paul was a graduate of two Universities. To Wycliffe we have already alluded.

Erasmus and his Greek New Testament was the forerunner of the Reformation. Luther's translation of the Bible into German stabilised his own work, and incidentally the language into which the Book had been translated. Wesley was a classical and philosophic student of the soundest and broadest attainments. Learning is the tool, vital spirituality the energy which can alone use that tool to the greatest ends. The hours and days and years of study at Oxford and Lutterworth lit Wycliffe's candle, which in its turn gave fire to the Hussite and Moravian lamp, destined, in God's time, to set the blazing torch of Wesley aflame. Good work may be hidden from the eyes of men for generations, but it can never be lost. At the very time that under Divine promise England might expect Divine light, she received it, through the birth, in 1325, of John Wycliffe. And at the very time that under Divine promise she might expect a flame lightening her darkest corners, she received it through the birth, in 1703, of John Wesley. But there is clear connection between the two events; in fact, these happenings were two parts of the same event.

We must not linger further upon Wycliffe and his preachers, but have to remark that leaders may be misunderstood, and followers are apt to become fanatics. Some harmless but ill-expressed ideas of Wycliffe's, relative to men only being possessors of their wealth when that wealth was held as a trust from God, led certain of the Lollards, in daily contact with a Church in which wealth was plethoric and spirituality nil, to adopt lines of thought savouring of communism, and there is little doubt that Lollardry paved the way for the violence of the Peasants' Rising. That "inward religion" which they taught, and so rightly, began to be mixed up with ideas concerning the holding of property which would not have tended to the well-being of the nation. Though we abhor the persecution which these people endured, we are bound to admit that some of the Lollards were awkward folk whom one would have been much tempted to persecute. They came to undervalue scholastic attainment, and "in the

Lollardish assertion that there was no need of human learning to open up Scriptures, they but anticipated a delusion not unknown among nineteenth-century Evangelicals." When people sin against learning, God has a controversy with those people. After a period of considerable court favour, they went under. But, as we have said, they continued to exist. They were a separate community. They married amongst themselves. They formed a Puritan nucleus when the time for Puritanism had come. In the Marian persecution, martyrs were most where the descendants of the Lollards had most foregathered. In the days of Elizabeth, Shakespeare whimsically and wickedly introduced their former leader, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, on to the stage as the wholly abandoned and wholly delightful Sir John Falstaff, the lecherous old rascal who declared that "he had lost his voice a-singing of anthems." It was all very well for the dramatist subsequently to deny the identity. Why had he referred to Falstaff as "my old lad of the castle"? Puritans were not over popular in Elizabeth's day; here was a great chance for appealing to the mirth of the wits, and Shakespeare took it. Had not the Puritans been generally recognised as the descendants of the Lollards the jest would have lost half its savour. But in later days our greatest national poet used to entertain the Puritan preachers at Stratford.

From the time of Wycliffe to the spacious days of Queen Elizabeth is a great jump, so great that we shall shortly retrace our steps a little. But we are in truth concerned rather with underlying principles than with the actual succession of events. Our continental wars for the retaining of fiefs in France alleged to be held in the right of our various sovereigns or their wives were now over, and Calais alone remained. Does not this point to definite national retrogression? No. That would have been the inevitable consequence of the holding of any extensive part of the mainland of the Continent. Our destiny was as yet to lie upon:

“This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise ;
This fortress, built by Nature for herself,
Against infection and the hand of war ;
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands ;
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England.”

There was to be no foreign invasion, and no foreign admixture. God was preparing a people for Himself, to populate the waste places of the earth, so soon to be revealed by the Elizabethan navigators. One has to grasp this plain fact, that God will work by whom He will work, that the stern task of the English under the last Tudor had to be prepared for by generations of hard fighting, hard-living knights and squires, and men-at-arms, who found their field of action in trouncing the French at Agincourt and Verneuil, and in trouncing each other in the Wars of the Roses ; as well as by the moral strengthening of character attendant upon the rise of the Puritan ; and by the mental stimulus of the New Learning and the Reformation. Soldier, saint, scholar, God required all three. And in the Englishmen of Elizabeth's court God often found all three in the same individual. Sir Philip Sydney was the greatest of his type. But he was not the only man of his type. To come to later days, God prepared for Waterloo by “the Methodists of England and the prize-fighters of England,” as we have elsewhere expressed it. There are some earnest good persons who will not swallow these facts, and it gives us the greatest pleasure to stand over them and make them swallow these facts.

At the risk of being wearisome, let us again repeat that the wealth of England, due to the wool trade ; the moral strength of England, due undoubtedly in its beginning to those awkward persons the Lollards ; the independent

spirit of the English peasant, due to the Black Death, the Lollards and Wat Tyler's rising; the physical strength and hardihood and the physical courage of England, due to generations of Continental war; the learning of England for which Henry VIII, personally and through his encouragement of Erasmus, deserves his due meed of praise—were all necessary for the Divine purpose, and all fitted into the Divine scheme. To bring the matter down to its practical application in much later days—when associated with Y.M.C.A. work we used occasionally to meet three types of persons who gave us the horrors: (1) the Bible-class young man who never went to the gymnasium; (2) the gymnasium young man who never went to the Bible-class; (3) the gymnasium-cum-Bible-class young man who never went to the library. From all three of them good Lord deliver England!

With reference to the Tudor period, a few dates and facts must be kept in mind if we are to attain to a fair estimate of the forces playing upon mankind at this time. In 1453 occurred an event enormous in its consequences, for in that year Constantinople was taken by the Turks. This circumstance led to merchants searching for a sea-route to India, in order to avoid the overland route which was now controlled by extortioners and worse. In pursuit of this attempt, Columbus, in 1492, butted up against the West Indian Isles; in 1497 John Cabot, with ship and crew from Bristol, found his way blocked by the mainland of America, and in the same year Vasco da Gama, more fortunate as regards his direct objective, doubled the Cape and reached India. The centre of political and maritime importance now shifted from the Mediterranean to those lands which had an Atlantic sea-board. The consequent benefit to these islands is obvious and stupendous. Gutenberg, with his movable types (1442), made it possible for the harvest of the New Learning to be fully reaped. In the reign of Henry VII history begins to be of enthralling interest, for at that period we virtually enter into our own times, as all historians will admit. It may not be a coincidence that it began in 1485, and therefore commenced

the "time of the end" (360 years) of Israel's punishment, which culminated in 1845.

It appears to be G. H. Lancaster's opinion that the Seven Times Era is one which is intended to be of wider use than for the mere measurement of the Seven Times chastisement, and that outstanding events in ancient Israel will have their sequence in corresponding events in modern Israel when the end of the era has come. Well, for those who care to follow this line of thought the results are sufficiently striking. Three of the chief occurrences in ancient Israel are the foundation (1012 B.C.) and the dedication (1003 B.C.) of Solomon's Temple, and the defection and idolatry of Northern Israel under Jeroboam (975 B.C.). Apply Lancaster's key, and we arrive (in solar years) at the modern dates of 1509, 1518, and 1546.

In 1509 there came to the throne King Henry VIII, who was destined to free this country from Papal power, though not from Romish doctrine. But in 1547—Seven Times apparently from the setting up of the golden calves—he was succeeded by his son Edward VI, who, with his own hand, removed from the Prayer Book the names of the saints appearing therein for purposes of invocation, and thus rid us of the last remnant of idolatry. And as regards the period 1509-18, Luther took his degree of Bachelor of Theology in the year of Henry's accession, and became a theological tutor; made his pilgrimage to Rome, from which he returned a Reformer, in 1511; and nailed his famous thesis against indulgences to the door of Wittenburg Church in 1517, with consequences soon known to all Europe, and of the deepest import for England.

So far as Henry VIII is concerned we shall have something to say as regards his kingcraft when dealing with the political conduct of another great man. We have been taught to believe him a monster of lust and cruelty, and, so long as we are placidly content to take our historical information from Roman Catholic sources, so long shall we believe this. The subject is too wide for further discussion here, and is not on the main track of our purpose, but we urge every Englishman to the perusal of two books dealing with this

time, Froude's *Henry VIII* and *Erasmus*, by the same author. Starting with the customary bias against this monarch, Froude, whose settled line of conduct in historical writing was to go for his facts not to a previous historian, but to the original and contemporary documents, came to certain definite conclusions of his own, which are worthy of more respectful consideration than they have always met with. Furthermore, when he found it necessary to write unpleasant things about Roman Catholicism and the monastic life, it was almost invariably from a Roman Catholic production that he drew his information. Add to this the indefatigable and tireless labour which he displayed in gathering facts from every authentic source, and we have a sound basis for history. At present Froude is insufficiently read. Some day he will come into his own.

At the very commencement of Henry's reign, with the overflowing treasury left him by his father, and under the instigation of that ambitious and able prelate and premier, Cardinal Wolsey, our foreign policy led in the direction of endeavouring to secure the election of Henry VIII as Roman Emperor and of Wolsey as Pope. This would have brought about an overlordship of Europe which might have proved disastrous to the overlords. The reformation of the church at which Wolsey aimed would have been a very partial affair, and in dissipating his strength on the Continent, Henry might never have accomplished the work he wrought for England. Providentially the scheme came to nothing.

The Papal duplicity shown in dealing with the case of Katherine of Aragon led to the Pope's losing his last shred of power in this land of ours. A "vicar of Christ" whose conduct was so time-servingly tortuous seemed to be an unworthy vicar, and Henry deemed that he and his subjects would be better without him. The Pope himself was placed in a position of extreme difficulty, owing to the fact that he knew himself to be not so much a "vicar of Christ" as a European monarch with a shaking throne, much in the power of neighbouring Sovereigns. Much may be forgiven him for one witty remark concerning the question of the legality of Henry's marriage to Katherine—"It is said that

the whole law of God is locked in the breast of the Pope, but when God made me Pope, *He never gave me the key.*" After so fair an admission of incapacity, nothing remains to be said.

The question of the spoliation of the Church by Henry is one concerning which it is most difficult to arrive at a final pronouncement. Anything in the way of sacrilege is an abomination. But the Church had no right to many of the broad acres to which she laid claim. She had obtained them by working on the fears of dying men. On the other hand, over and over again had it happened that a Cistercian Abbey had been presented with a wilderness, which the hard labour of the brethren had turned into smiling farm land. It was right to take wealth from a corrupt church, provided that that wealth was definitely used in the service of God. There was undoubtedly a slack recognition of responsibility at this crisis. Church lands were in some cases sold to favourites at suspiciously low prices, though even then one has to remember that the fact of there being so much land in the market would tend to depressed values. As for the pecuniary results as regards the crown, it was the intention of the sovereign that the produce of the spoils should go to the foundation of new bishoprics, a scheme which was probably largely foiled owing to the expenses attendant on the suppression of the "*Pilgrimage of Grace.*" Had this insurrection succeeded, we should have been again under papal dominance, and money used to deliver us from this fate was money used in the service of God. That it did not succeed was due to the fact that Henry was able to raise sufficient troops in the south, in that quarter of our land ploughed and sown by the Lollards, to subdue the Roman Catholic north. We doubt whether he would have cared to acknowledge the ultimate source of his own strength, but here is the truth of the matter. Of course, his army was not composed of Lollards, but merely of men who, whilst retaining temporarily Roman Catholic dogma, had come under the enlightening influence of the descendants of Wycliffe's followers. With the result that they were in some respects not so obtuse of intellect as the rest of folk. That

King and nobles had perfectly clean hands in the matter of the church treasures we do not believe, though remembering how the estates of the nobles had been shorn by the cupidity of worldly-minded ecclesiastics working on the superstition of their dying forefathers, we are not too much disposed to blame the nobles. In the long last, the treasure was largely used in the service of God and in maintaining the freedom of this country. And there we leave a most difficult problem, a problem in the discussion of which even a Protestant writer like Lansdell has dealt too severely with Henry. We have brought it into prominence because it is our settled conviction that the prosperity of Israel, in things both spiritual and temporal, depends to a hitherto unrecognised extent upon the practical recognition of God's claims upon material things.

One word upon the European Turk who took Constantinople in 1453 and calmly squatted there. This fellow is so utterly different in appearance from his Mongolian forebears that ethnologists would, if they could, deny his ancestry. It is, however, so well established that even the most reluctant of scientists has to admit the authenticity of his genealogical tree. We know of two oriental races who, settling in Europe, completely changed their facial type, the Turk and the Magyar. We think there is a third.

CHAPTER V.

THE THIRD DAY : THE PURITANS.

“ A small one shall become a strong nation ; I the Lord will hasten it in his time.”—*Isaiah* lx, 22.

THE reign of Elizabeth was destined, Biblically, to be marked by some great circumstance leading ultimately to the elucidation of prophecy. It lasted from 1558 to 1603. In the last chapter of Daniel the prophet is told to seal the book “ even to the time of the end : many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.” A time is 360 years. Deduct this figure from the time of the end, and we arrive at the commencement of the period of the unsealing. Many persons take the time of the end to be 1917, the date at which Jerusalem came into the possession of Israel, and having regard to the concluding verses of the chapter, their building is not without foundation. In 1558, but in the prophetic year 1557, Calais was taken. This was the death-blow of Queen Mary. Her death ushered in the glories of Elizabethan England.

At the same time, and particularly in view of our belief that prophecy is fulfilled in a series of events rather than finding its culmination in one event only, that there are a series of “ ends ” rather than one end only, we are not satisfied that the accession of Elizabeth exhausts the subject or that it even marks the main issue. Two other “ ends ” we may note, that of Israel’s chastisement in 1845, and of Judah’s in 1933-6. Deduct the “ time ” in each case, and we arrive at the years 1485 and 1573-6. We have already seen that 1485 marks the beginning of the Tudor Dynasty, the patrons of learning. What does 1573-6 mark ? Francis Bacon, the product of learning, though a greater than his teachers. It is to him that it is due that “ many run to and fro, and

knowledge is increased.”* It was during these very years, 1573-6, that Bacon, a student at Cambridge, became so heart-sick of the barrenness and futility of the then methods of thinking that he determined to set the whole world thinking in a new direction. With the result that we are now steeped in and permeated by the scientific method, which, as applied by Grattan Guinness, Lancaster, and Thomas to the unsealing of prophecy, has brought about that unsealing.

Though it is irrelevant to our subject, and has no bearing upon prophecy, we may remark that it was in 1574 that the kindly-disposed Elizabeth gave “divers outlandish and Godly persons” the right to worship in the Crypt of Canterbury, and to set up their looms therein. This hospitable act was for the benefit of Huguenot refugees, whose descendants, as is well known, still have their chapel there.

In the reign of Elizabeth, England reached a higher status internationally than had ever previously been her lot. The earlier years of that reign constituted a period requiring the most delicate steering of the helm of state. “It was of the Lord’s mercies that we were not consumed.” As a relic of Wolsey’s statesmanship, albeit a most necessary one, the doctrine of “the balance of power” had come to be recognised, and with unfriendly and powerful continental neighbours, who had to be played off one against the other, our foreign politics seemed often to assume a zig-zag and tortuous course. The early experiences of the Queen taught her the necessity for constant reserve and unwearied diplomacy. Watched over with hatred and jealousy by her sister, Queen Mary, the child of Katherine of Aragon, the divorced wife of Henry VIII, the daughter of Anne Boleyn knew that the slightest deviation from subservience, the slightest whisper that might be twisted into an appearance of disaffection and treason, would cost her her life. This was a hard school, but the pupil was apt. In learning to save her own neck from the malice of an unnatural relative she learnt to save Protestant England

* See *The Old Book and the New Age*. Ch. I.

from Catholic Europe. She could hold her tongue. She could avoid an immediate decision. She could wait her time. When the time came, she struck.

Mary left her a dreadful heritage. Under the last Romish and Tudor Sovereign of England we had become a by-word amongst the nations. A daughter of Henry VIII lived to lose Calais. With rotten ships and contemptible armament the descendants of the victors of Agincourt were kicked out of their last solitary French possession. Mary died, and Elizabeth was called to a dishonoured crown.

There followed the years of waiting and of quiet preparation. In the providence of God nothing of vital import was permitted until this period of preparation had elapsed. In 1587 it was known definitely that Spain was preparing to attack. By way of lending a helping hand, Sir Francis Drake courteously sailed to Cadiz and destroyed a large part of the Spanish stores and transport. The consequent delay gave the then Spanish High Admiral time to die, and to be replaced by a fool.

The work had to be done over again, and in 1588 all was ready. So were we. A large army was assembled for the defence of London. The county militias waited for the glare of the beacon to march at a moment's notice. But our country was under no fear of an invasion. The wind blew up Channel, and our light shipping could attack when and where they chose, while the huge Spanish galleons were helpless. As each Spanish vessel was taken, its powder magazines were emptied for further use against one of her sister ships, for of powder our supply was none too good. The foe took refuge in Calais Harbour. Our fire ships brought them out again. They then resolved to try the hospitality of the Netherlands. The wind set exactly right for our fleet, and they were headed off into the North Sea. Faced with a hostile Norway and an unfriendly Denmark there was nothing for it but to attempt to go home by way of the north of Scotland. So far as our fleet was concerned there was no particular reason why they should not. The powder question was getting serious. The supply had lasted just long enough to break

the hearts of the foe. "Huddled together by the wind and the deadly English fire, their sails torn, their masts shot away, the crowded galleons had become mere slaughter houses."

The winds of the Orkneys did their work, and "of that noble armament which might have changed the history of the world, a few scattered ships alone reached Spain." The victory was God's, but, as is invariably the case, the bravery and hardihood and skill of man had first to be placed at the Divine disposal. This done, God would do the rest. At the time of the Armada, England reached a pinnacle of greatness. She had to descend to a valley before re-ascending as the time of full blessing drew near. The Tudors were succeeded by the Stuarts. Just as the dark hour had preceded de Montfort and Wycliffe and all that they had meant for the country, so did another disgraceful period usher in the very ending of the Seven Times. A Tudor conquered the "Invincible Armada," and a Stuart helplessly let the Dutch fleet up the Medway, what time they bombarded Chatham Dockyard.

To work out the Divine purpose for these islands, England and Scotland were destined to become one. This could only come about by a union of Crowns, at a date much anterior to any possible union of peoples, and by way of quiet preparation for that union of peoples. Scotland was not Wales.

Elizabeth died, and was succeeded by James VI of Scotland—in England James I. His character was sufficiently described by the witty Court chaplain, who, entering the pulpit in the King's presence gave out—"My text is James, First and Sixth, 'he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.'" Four Stuarts drove our ancestors to William of Orange and constitutional liberty. Two Stuarts drove them to Oliver Cromwell and despotism. Over Cromwell we intend to linger a little. The character of this man demands the riveted attention of all men who believe in our Israelitish descent. They may not approve of all he did, but he manifested a measured strength in the doing which arouses one's startled admira-

tion. He was a Christian believer, but constantly in his Old Testament. He was an Englishman to the backbone, but not a typical Englishman. He was merely representative of a type. But from that type has come much of what is best and most virile in our nation. He is the chief of the Puritans, of those rather angular persons who were sown by Wycliffe and watered by the Reformation, who were lowered at by the people and made a jest of on the stage, who were, many of them, considered even by Elizabeth as beyond the pale of the broad communion of the Anglican Church. One day these men woke up to find themselves masters of England. Cromwell had made them so.

Cromwell was born in 1599. He was educated under a certain Puritan schoolmaster of the name of Dr. Beard. Dr. Beard was an author, after the straitest sect of the Pharisees. His works include two tomes intended to prove that the Pope is Antichrist, in which thesis he may, for anything we know to the contrary, be wholly in the right ; and an extraordinary production of morbid genius called the *Theatre of God's Judgments Displayed*. We all remember the story of the little boy who went fishing on a Sunday and got drowned. The learned Doctor had ransacked all history, sacred and profane, for stories of little boys who went fishing on Sunday, with appropriate termination, had collected them into a portly volume, and issued it to a greatly edified world. It would be interesting to know how far this harsh Puritan schoolmaster had succeeded in grafting his own characteristics on the youthful Oliver.

From the rather untender clutches of Dr. Beard, Cromwell escaped when about seventeen years of age, and was entered at Sidney Sussex College. How long he remained up we do not know. He was never a man of great learning ; he carried on his conversations with the Dutch Ambassador in Latin, but from a sentence or two of Bishop Burnet's we gather that Cromwell's Latin approached that of Augustus Small's of Boniface—it was “canine to a degree.” There is a legend, probably true, that after leaving Cambridge he read law at Lincoln's Inn. It was quite customary in that

age for a man to go up to town for a year or two before settling down on the family estate, his parents being under the happy impression that his days and nights were employed in learning the mysteries of conveyancing and the criminal code, with a view to the better discharge of his duties as magistrate and guardian of the paternal heritage. Possibly Cromwell may have occupied the very chambers formerly tenanted by the immortal Justice Shallow. At any rate he must occasionally have sought relaxation from too intensive study, for at twenty-one years of age he married Elizabeth Bourchier, daughter of a London merchant.

From this time till 1640, or later, there is nothing requiring particular record, save that at twenty-nine he was returned as a member for the borough of Cambridge. Furthermore, during this interval he underwent his religious conversion, a period apparently of intense nervous and mental distress, somewhat parallel with the experience of Bunyan. And here let us throw out one necessary caution which is applicable to the lives of nearly all great Puritan leaders. They were invariably attacked by malicious tongues after their elevation on the ground of the notorious immorality of their past lives, and evidence was called as to such immorality from their own correspondence. If the quotations be examined they will be found to consist of vague and irrelevant confessions of "the debaucheries, the wickedness, vanity, and emptiness of my own worldly heart, my exceeding lust after wickedness"—and dozens of similar stock phrases.

What does it all mean? From the standpoint of actual and outward morals it means simply nothing, except that in his pre-Puritanic days, before he had taken to wearing a starchless collar, and a hat without a band, before he had changed his name from John Smith to Tribulation Wholesome, he had been addicted to the eating of plum-porridge at Christmas, had perhaps so far forgotten himself as to snatch a kiss from some buxom wench under the mistletoe, and had even gone to the length, under the advice of the parish clergyman, of playing skittles on a Sunday afternoon. Anyone who lays to the account of Cromwell or Bunyan

any peccadillos more serious than those enumerated above on the strength of their own disconnected and platitudinous testimony, knows nothing of Puritanism. There is of course a deep and spiritual meaning underlying their apparent confessions, but this their opponents have rarely sufficient spirituality to divine.

So here is Cromwell, about forty-two years of age, having been, to adopt his own words, "born a gentleman, living neither in any considerable height nor yet in obscurity"; he is a Member of Parliament, lives the life of a yeoman farmer, and takes his family regularly to church on Sundays, where he customarily appears with a red flannel bandage round his neck, being much liable to sore throat.

"Who was Pelagius?" "Please, sir, Pelagius was a Welshman called Morgan," was the divinity student's reply. Cromwell was a Welshman called Williams. Or to put it rather more accurately, the Williams family took the name of Cromwell two or three generations before Oliver's birth. Thereby hangs a tale. He was the descendant of a certain Richard Williams who was nephew to Thomas Cromwell, Henry VIII's second great prime minister, the man who hammered the monks. In the general sequestration of church property certain manors belonging to the priory of Hinchinbrook and the Abbey of Ramsey had, not so very mysteriously, come into nephew Richard's hands. Nephew Richard was an astute man, and contrived to retain the favour of the king and the said manors after Cromwell's fall, and adopted the Cromwell name. This not too relevant fact will perhaps serve as a link, for if we are correctly to judge between Charles I and Cromwell we must hark back to Tudor times. The trouble had its beginning then.

Henry VIII, tyrannical, autocratic, self-willed, was passionately beloved by the high-spirited nation over whom he ruled. Save for the Pilgrimage of Grace his reign was scarcely disturbed by internal tumult. This must have been a great man, a charming man, a man's man. He was a theological writer, he was a musician—an anthem of his is now occasionally sung at St. George's, Windsor—he was a sportsman, he was a man who deeply and truly loved

England ; and England returned his love by permitting him to rule in the one manner in which England could in those times of stress be ruled—unconstitutionally.

By unconstitutionally we do not mean that England was without the full paraphernalia of King, Lords, Commons, Magna Charta, and all other rights, privileges, and nuisances appertaining to the heritage of the free-born Englishman. But we do mean that the King occasionally obtained forced loans by means of what were euphemistically called “ Benevolences ” ; that on at least one occasion the Commons were roundly informed that had they not one afternoon consented to a measure rejected in the morning half their heads would have been on pikes at Temple Bar * ; that the King exercised the right of levying ship-money on seaport towns, without any authorisation of Parliament whatsoever, Magna Charta to the contrary notwithstanding ; and that the Government of this country was so carried on under Henry VIII and his great daughter Elizabeth that Charles I and James II had no lack of precedent for nearly all, if not all, of the alleged unconstitutional acts which created that festering sore which spread over the whole country in one inflammatory and purulent discontent.

The Tudors loved, understood, and trusted their people, who in turn gave them an affection which, as regards Elizabeth at any rate, lasts to this day. Cromwell himself never concealed his admiration for Elizabeth.

If Henry levied a “ Benevolence ” the country knew that the money was required for the country’s good, and would be expended in promoting it. With the means of communication so miserably inefficient the King could not consult his Commons over every trifle. And if the worst came to the worst, well, Henry kept a standing army of a hundred or so men, and every yeoman in England was a soldier. No Tudor could have retained his throne for three months after forfeiting the affection of his subjects. This fact was well known to both parties. Meanwhile, however, precedents

* A fact which can only, though fully, be explained by the circumstance that it required the whole weight of King and Commons to outweigh the Nobles. Henry had, therefore, to keep the Commons to heel, or have the land devastated by anarchy.

contrary to the polity of this realm were undoubtedly established, and it only required the raising of a permanent standing army sworn to the Throne to deprive our forefathers of the last remnant of their much-boasted constitutional liberties, and to do it under the cloak of strict precedent and lawful procedure. When we remind ourselves of the fact that this is exactly and precisely what did actually take place in half the countries in Europe we can realise how imminent the danger was. Roughly speaking, the seventeenth century marks the rise of the trading classes, and this change in the economy of nations sent every man to his own place. The farmer became farmer pure and simple; the merchant sold his goods; the militant type took to the profession of arms. Previously all men had been amateur soldiers, but a distinct military caste had scarcely existed. Now the national manhood was analysed into its inherently constituent elements. Moreover, this very process of separation into different trades and callings vastly increased "the wealth of nations," and thereby gave kings and princes the means of paying for a vastly increased military retinue. Nations were now divided internally into numbers of fat sheep waiting to be fleeced, and a few fierce watch-dogs capable of acting a part savouring somewhat of that customarily pertaining to the wolf. Merchants got wealthier, traders increased their store, all things seemed outwardly to go well, but the very foundation of national liberty had been sapped. Parliaments and free assemblies toppled to their doom in every part of Europe. We alone were saved, and we were saved by the fact of God, in His providence, filling the throne of England at the psychological moment with one of the most hopeless, helpless, inane, and drivelling fools who has ever rejoiced in the name of King.

James the First would have made a respectable pedagogue in a village school; or he might have earned a just reputation at ruri-decanal meetings as a learned and highly eccentric curate. Had he possessed one quarter of Henry VIII's masterfulness he would have seized the opportunity presented, engaged in Continental war, possessed himself of the

glamour of arms, and brought his disciplined and trained army back to our shores to establish himself as a monarch after the type which Louis the Fourteenth subsequently became in France. Fortunately he was a rank coward. Always prating of Kingcraft and the Divine Right, no man in his realms displayed less of the dignity rightfully and allowably attaching to his exalted position. Opposition made him cower. His reign was one of almost profound peace—because he lacked the hardihood for any other atmosphere. One thing he did, and did so supremely well that upon him principally must be laid the onus of his son's death. He inoculated that son with so strong a virus of autocracy that there was no escaping the suggestion forced upon him by the doting, learned, peevish, pedagogic father. The dreams of the one generation became the deeds of the next. For James taught, until it became Charles' second nature as he listened, that the office of Kingship was so supreme, so absolute, so lofty, that a King neither owed nor could owe responsibility of any sort or type, either of good faith or of pledged word or of contract, to the people over whom he ruled.

Let us remember this in justice to the wretched man who expiated his father's folly on a certain January day outside the banqueting Hall at Whitehall. Charles is accused of bad faith, and the facts substantiate the charge. Let us recollect that his father had instilled into him this choice sample of autocratic philosophy—that the King's power, as Divinely bestowed, was so final that the royal promise was only binding and could only be binding so long as the King chose to give it effect, and that by no process could the Lord's Anointed divest himself of the God-given right to do as he pleased, when he pleased, where he pleased, promises, compacts, covenants, leagues, and treaties notwithstanding. Archbishop Laud shared the inevitable nemesis.

For his experience of Presbyterians in Scotland when a young monarch was such as to cause James to abhor the name of Presbyterian, and rush into the arms of episcopacy. In this James has our strong sympathy. Some allowance

must be made for human nature, and in the case of a young King, accustomed to hearing himself called "God's silly vassal" by domineering Presbyterian ministers, to hearing his mother, during her imprisonment and after her execution at Fotheringay, continually alluded to in terms the only adequate reply to which would have been a stout oak-staff brought down heavily on a Presbyterian pate, the allowance must be proportionately increased. These "priests writ large," as they have been properly described, had the spirit of the most relentless spiritual tyranny in their very blood.* To hurt, to humiliate, to insult, to make a man small and contemptible in his own eyes, was to them exceeding savoury. Their example gave James an irresistible bias in favour of that government of the Church by bishops which he enforced upon his son as an essential part of Kingcraft.

On Charles succeeding to his father's throne he proved the lesson had been well learnt. With the assistance of Archbishop Laud he set himself to bring Scotland under the episcopal regime, with prayer-book and liturgy specially prepared for their requirements.

Foolishly, after years of mis-government in England, after eleven years in which no Parliament was ever allowed to sit for the voicing of public grievances, the King embroiled himself with a nation of Presbyterian hornets over a matter of episcopalian discipline. He lacked no precedent, for Henry Tudor had led his people out of Roman Catholicism; Edward VI, by his Council drew them into Puritanism; Mary back to Catholicism; and Elizabeth forward to Anglicanism, virtually the whole nation following like a flock of sheep. But one thing King Charles forgot. And that one essential thing was that he who applied an English precedent to a Scotch problem was likely to gain much experience and untold tribulation for his pains.

* In his *History of Civilisation*, Buckle described Scotland under the Presbyterian regime as the most priest-ridden country in Europe. It is noticeable that more than a century later two Scotsmen of broad outlook, James Boswell and Sir Walter Scott, would have nothing to do with the Presbyterian church of their fathers, but joined the Episcopal church in Scotland.

The Scotch rose in arms, and this gave England her opportunity. Things had become intolerable. It was one thing to be ruled autocratically by a Tudor who loved you, and another thing to be ruled, on Tudor precedents, by a Stuart who loved only himself. The immediate trouble was tided over, but this was merely a postponement. The civil war commenced. The Royal standard was unfurled at Nottingham in 1642. No sooner was it unfurled than it was blown down. Those who are superstitious may find much matter for curious speculation in Charles' career. At his coronation he robed in white as though for burial, instead of purple, for crowning, and the preacher on that occasion gave out as his text the ominous passage "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." This snapping of the pole on which the standard floated was looked on as a presage of evil to come. One other small fact connected with the opening of the campaign is so curious that it ought to be preserved, for the comfort of those of us who are continually lamenting the loss of our old-fashioned English summer. On the outbreak of war Prince Rupert rushed over from the Continent to the assistance of his uncle, and landed in Northumberland. His first adventure was a broken collar-bone, sustained through his horse slipping on the frozen road. This adventure happened to him in the month of August.

England was divided against herself, from north to south. Sir Oliver Cromwell of Hinchinbrook was out for the King. Oliver Cromwell raised a troop of eighty men for the Parliament. All of them had been known to him personally.

Their character in quarters was as much to him as their conduct in the field. He wanted no hirelings, but men who knew for what they fought, and loved their cause to the death. Knowing nothing of war, he, at forty-three years of age, he who was to become perhaps the finest leader of light cavalry England has ever known, entrusted himself and his little band to the discipline of a Dutch officer. And from this nucleus arose the army of Ironsides, whose backs no man ever saw, who advanced into battle singing hymns of victory, who delivered England, subdued Ireland under a

heel of iron, routed and destroyed the forces of Scotland, displayed at Dunkirk such discipline and valour as to provoke the unstinted and superlative applause of the great Turenne himself, and who, on the Restoration, returning manfully to civil life so conducted themselves that if a village carpenter or smith were renowned for workmanlike ability and sterling integrity it was ten chances to one that he had been a trooper of old Noll's. It was in his 50,000 soldiers that Cromwell found his truest expression. No such army as this has the world ever known.

The system of discipline obtaining in the Puritan army was certainly peculiar. We remember having heard a story about a prayer-meeting held in a Scotch University, presided over by an elderly and venerable professor. A student rose to pray, in words something like the following: "O Lord, Thou has taught us that a hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness, but what, O Lord, if it be found in the way which leads to Tophet? Have mercy, O Lord, upon the ancient man who presides over this assembly. We would like to be assured of his salvation, but we are not. May he be warned in time. Lead him to spend the miserable remnant of existence which remains to him in seeking the way of life," etc., etc. Now something like this was a matter of constant occurrence among the Puritan troops. On duty they were soldiers. Off duty they were religionists. If, therefore, a devout corporal saw symptoms of backsliding in the colonel the colonel was solemnly warned to take heed to his walk and conduct, after which seasonable admonition their former respective status was resumed. Let anyone who wishes to learn what these men were re-read the *Pilgrim's Progress*. This great classic is a mine of historic information. Mr. Justice Hate-Good is Lord Jeffreys to the life, the actual demeanour and language when on the bench of "that bawling devil," as Lodowic Muggleton called him, being reproduced to the letter. And in Great-Heart and also in the "Man of very stout countenance," who said "set down my name sir," you see two Ironsides whom Bunyan had known and who are now immortalised. Let us repro-

duce the passage referring to the latter: "The man drew his sword, and put an helmet upon his head, and rushed toward the door upon the armed men who laid upon him with deadly force; but the man, not at all discouraged, fell to cutting and hacking most fiercely; so after he had received and given many wounds to them that attempted to keep him out, he cut his way through them all, and pressed forward into the Palace; at which there was a pleasant voice heard from those within, even of those that walked upon the top of the Palace, saying

Come in, Come in;

Eternal glory thou shalt win."

Lord Macaulay has emphasised how naturally Bunyan's characters turn from praying to fighting, and from fighting to praying, and points out that this proceeds from the fact that the said characters are not figments of the imagination, but drawn straight from life. The above passage is simply a description, pretty nearly in the man's own words, of how some stout sergeant of Ireton or Bradshaw's fought his way into a Royalist manor-house.

Now note this strange paradox of history. The one essential for the preservation of our constitutional liberty in this century with which we are dealing was "no standing army." But that half of England which had risen originally in defence of its liberties raised a standing army and imposed its heavy yoke upon the whole of England. The country was divided into eleven districts, each presided over by a Major-General, who ruled with a rod of iron. Providentially this standing army was commanded by a Lord Protector ruling by irregular title. On the Restoration, and in so conservative a country as England the Restoration was only a matter of time, the nation had learnt its lesson. The country in its overflowing joy at having got rid of the saints would have given, and did give, Charles II everything except the one thing necessary to establish an autocratic regime—a large permanent force. The very name stank in its nostrils. It was the role of Cromwell not to be the liberator of his country, but to be the forerunner of the liberator. And Cromwell fulfilled his task in two ways,

positively and negatively. Positively by the system of government by standing army pursued in his lifetime ; negatively by making that system so abhorred that never could our forefathers be induced to entrust Charles II or James II with the same weapon of oppression. Given a good title and a disciplined force, and the ruler of England could have done away with our constitution for good and all.

Cromwell was certainly not without personal ambition, for once in reference to himself he let fall the cryptic utterance "no man goes so far as he who knows not whither he is going," and on another occasion, walking in St. James's Park one morning, he observed, "How if a man should take upon himself to be King?" King he never was ; he might have been, but for the fear of the Republican army, that Frankenstein he had himself called into being. For he had learnt the lesson that he who would customarily rule must sometimes obey. And with the title of Lord Protector he had to be content.

As regards the supreme mistake of his life, the execution of Charles I, let it be remembered that the root motive for the King's incarceration lay in the imminent peril of the Sovereign's effecting the conquest of England by means of an Irish or Scotch army. The King was executed. This was a political blunder of the first magnitude, because the centre of disaffection was now transferred from a man who was in prison to a man who was not, which fact tells its own tale. Ireland and Scotland were drubbed into submission by the Ironsides. Cromwell's every thought was indubitably for the well-being of the England which he loved with the whole strength of his rugged manly nature. He might bully her, he might for her own good, as he thought, coerce her, but he loved her with every fibre of his being. The Scotch Presbyterians had endeavoured to force their own scheme of ecclesiastical polity upon her, and the Protector would no more permit her to be rough-ridden by Presbyterian preachers than by Laudian bishops. The Scotch campaign gave him the needed opportunity for returning his personal thanks for their avowed intentions, and

every Presbyterian kirk he met with was forthwith turned into a stable for his troop-horses.

Next to his love of England came the love of his fellow Protestants all the world over. "If this persecution of the Waldenses does not cease," he thundered, "I will make the English cannon to be heard at the gates of Rome." He is inclined to make league with France, because he finds the Huguenots reasonably well treated there. His hatred for Spain increases with the years. The Spanish plate-fleet is attacked by Blake, and 200,000 pounds in silver is carted through the streets of London for deposit in the Tower, the fruits of Blake's action. Another fleet goes west, and adds Jamaica to the British possessions. Dunkirk is taken from the Spanish possessions in Europe. The Spanish Ambassador is informed that there will be amity with his master if the iniquities of the Inquisition cease, as regards Englishmen at any rate, and if interference with our West India trade comes to an end. "You are asking for my master's two eyes," he exclaims.

Cromwell's foreign policy has been greatly extolled. He certainly added to our Empire, and made his country feared in every quarter of the globe. But perhaps there are indications that he was prepared to go too far in his schemes of a European Protestant League, that he might have found himself with an empty exchequer and an army hopelessly tied up in the forests of Germany. From this danger we were preserved. At fifty-nine years of age Cromwell was an old man, worn out with the hardship of his campaigns and the anxiety of his protectorate. Towards the close of August, 1658, he took to his chamber, and the end was not long in coming. He died on the 3rd September, the anniversary of Dunbar and Worcester, but not until he had breathed a last prayer for his country, most happily preserved for our instruction and admonition.

"Lord, though I am a miserable and wretched creature I am in covenant with Thee through grace, and I may, I will come to Thee for Thy people. Thou hast made me, though very unworthy, a mean instrument to do them some good, and Thee service, and many of them have set too

high a value upon me, though others wish and would be glad of my death. Lord, however Thou do dispose of me, continue to go on to do good for them. Give them consistency of judgment, one heart and mutual love ; and go on to deliver them, and with the work of reformation, and make the name of Christ glorious in the world. Teach those who look too much on Thy instruments to depend more upon Thyself. Pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are Thy people too. And pardon the folly of this short prayer ; even for Jesus Christ's sake. And give us a good night if it be Thy pleasure. Amen."

Cromwell was dead. The reign of the saints was over, and the reign of the harlots began. For Puritanism repressed vice with the sword, but it had not ostracised vice with the Sword of the Spirit. The country was swept and garnished, but it was empty. The Stuarts returned, and the devils with them. The era of full blessing had not yet come. The Puritans were before their time, just as the Crusaders were before their time when, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they attempted a work which could not have been accomplished till 1917. Moreover, the Puritans had misrepresented the God of Israel. Not in their raising the army of Ironsides, and in going forth conquering and to conquer, for the Lord is a Man of War ; but in their dourness, their condemnation of the innocent jovialities of life the enjoyment of which is actually enjoined upon Israel in the Old Book. They fell far short of the purposes of God in producing a people not merely strong and virile and clean living, but also kindly and happy and broadhearted. This error has dogged Puritanism all its days, and it is rampant in Puritanism now. To put it in the briefest and most parabolic form possible and merely by way of illustration, Puritanism has never had the capacity to distinguish between the playing of cards for money and the jolly old game of whist played by one's own hearthside on a winter's night, and played for the love of the game and of one's neighbour. Cards were the devil's prayer-book, and there was an end of it, and if old Hugh Latimer

found them so little of the devil's prayer-book that he preached his "Sermons on the Card" therefrom, well, old Hugh ought to have known better. * As if there were not enough real sins in the world, Puritanism has never been content unless it were manufacturing a few more.

Just a paragraph with reference to Cromwell and the Jews. The Jews had been banished since the end of the thirteenth century, but this does not mean that it was possible to keep them altogether out of the country. From whence did Shakespeare get his Shylock? The Jewish problem may have been an awkward one for the Puritans to tackle, for, from their habit of quoting the Old Testament and labelling themselves with ancient Biblical names, and from the custom which some of them had adopted of observing the Sabbath from sundown to sundown, certain of the scoffers had thrown out broad hints as to the Puritans entertaining a love for the Jewish religion inconsistent with a rigid adherence to the Christian faith. We have this amusingly illustrated in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), in which Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, a Puritan minister, discourses at length with himself as to the propriety of a liberal indulgence in roast pork. "It may be eaten, and in the Fair, I take it, in a booth, in the tents of the wicked . . . so it be eaten with a reformed mouth. . . . In the way of comfort to the weak, I will go and eat. I will eat exceedingly, and prophesy; there may be good use made of it, too, now I think on't; by the public eating of swine's flesh, to profess our hating and loathing of Judaism,

* "And for because I cannot declare Christ's rule unto you at one time, as it ought to be done, I will apply myself according to your custom at this time of Christmas; I will, as I said, declare unto you Christ's rule, but that shall be in Christ's cards. And whereas you are wont to celebrate Christmas in playing at cards, I intend, by God's grace, to deal unto you Christ's cards, wherein you shall perceive Christ's rule. The game that we shall play at shall be called the triumph, which, if it be well played at, he that dealeth shall win; the players shall likewise win; and the standers and lookers upon shall do the same; insomuch that there is no man willing to play at this triumph with these cards, but they shall be all winners, and no losers." "Triumph" was the forerunner of whist, and judging from the sermon, Latimer had a sound acquaintance with the rules of the game.

whereof the brethren stand taxed. I will therefore eat, yea, I will eat exceedingly."

However this may have been, Cromwell, earnestly desirous of wholly removing the ban, was only able to go so far as to grant a certain number of private dispensations to individual Jews to reside in England, and to connive at the existence of a small synagogue and a cemetery. It was not the godliness of the Puritans, but the extravagances of Charles II, that opened wide the door which Cromwell could only leave ajar.

CHAPTER VI.

THE THIRD DAY : THE ANGLICANS.

“ The help that is done upon the earth, God doeth it Himself.”—*Psalm lxxiv*, 12. (Ancient translation.)

WE are now to consider in this, and the following chapter, and to the best of our ability, the very last small portion of time lying within that period of the Third Day which still preceded the era of fuller blessing. The reigning monarchs of this period were Charles II, James II, and William of Orange. The commencement of the concluding period of the Chastisement is heralded by the accession of Queen Anne, the last of the Stuarts. Her short but useful reign, to the utility of which Her Majesty contributed but little, gave a little necessary space for the settlement of the national mind, after the turmoil created by the essential though somewhat unhappy events connected with William of Orange. That great man wrought a mighty deliverance for an ungrateful and stiff-necked people, ourselves to wit. Even after the enormities of James II there remained amongst us those who were so hypnotised by the glamour of the Stuart tartan that they would have welcomed a return of that evil family, which in the long last would have meant a return to Rome. During the reign of Queen Anne economic causes, the growth and utility of the Bank of England being certainly one, led to a strengthening of those interests which were opposed to the Stuart pretensions. During the earlier years of William, Churchill, the greatest soldier in Europe, kept one not unfriendly eye constantly upon the French Court and the English ex-Monarch who was kept pensioner there. On Queen Mary's death his whole weight was thrown into the scale to keep William on the throne. For he was to be succeeded by Anne, over

whose weak intellect Churchill's wife asserted an entire predominance, and William's health was weak. A time was looming when the ambitious Churchill would be the uncrowned King of England. But not if Jacobitism were any longer to be trifled with. In his own interests Churchill threw all his weight against France and the Stuarts. His interests happened to be the interests of his country. The reign of Anne afforded, as we have suggested, a little time for the country to settle down, and prosper, and to think. On her death the newly-crowned King of Hanover was able to take up the succession without disturbance, an event which could not have happened twelve years before. Even here, however, we must make full allowance for the influence of Churchill, now Duke of Marlborough. This secured the Protestant line of monarchs. The essential reasons for the maintenance of our national Protestantism will be dealt with shortly.

To understand what the history of our country has really been since 1198, we must try to get beneath the surface of things, to endeavour to ascertain the forces which were playing upon the minds of the people, to realise for what end these forces were divinely permitted to play, to disregard men, and to concentrate upon facts. For a man is only useful as the expression of a fact. Henry VIII was the concentrated essence of "no Popish dominion in these realms." That is one fact. Cromwell is Puritanism, another fact. Wesley is Evangelism, another fact, with which we deal in later chapters. Queen Elizabeth is Anglicanism. The greatest forces in our later history are Anglicanism and Puritanism, and their compound, Methodism. It has always most strongly appeared to us that these forces of Anglicanism and Puritanism are curiously illustrated by the occurrence in the ancient Jewish religion of two parallel and useful modes of worship in the later Jewish church, the Temple worship and the synagogue worship. The former was outward, gorgeous, impressive, national. The latter heartsearching, simple, almost individual. We admit that in the Anglican Church and in the Nonconformist Chapel these two modes overlap to some

extent, but, nevertheless, they are there. There ought to be one broadbased National Church for the outward expression (and, as regards individuals, for the outpouring of the heart also) of the national worship, and, taking example from the Temple, this worship should be as glorious as the national Prayer-Book fairly permits of. What can be more meet than the collective worship of God under such splendid outward show of pomp and circumstance as clergy honestly true to our reformed Church can still take part in? What is more proper than that such national churches should, for the glory of God, receive such ornamentation (but always, as Ruskin taught, out of our superfluities) as make the buildings outwardly more worthy for the great purpose for which they exist? Why should we live in ceiled houses, and the House of God be neglected? What is more meet than that the service of such churches be conducted by men who are the best product of our Universities, and that the music seek to emulate that offered in worship by the great Levitical choirs of the Temple at Jerusalem? We suggest that such are the aims of Anglicanism, a place where God is worshipped in reverence and in beauty, a house in which the learning, the wealth, the scholarship, and the art of the nation are offered in His service.

But an individual partaker in this our national worship may still be (he need not be) a being somewhat outward and external. The springs of conduct have not necessarily been touched. If he is to come face to face with a righteous God, and know himself to be but a sinner, it may be that it is in the quietude of the synagogue and in the simple expounding of the Scripture that this essential result, essential for him as an individual, is most likely to be reached.

A conscientious Anglican clergyman can give his flock all the benefits of both Temple and synagogue. A conscientious Nonconformist minister can give his flock all the benefits of the synagogue, and some of those of the Temple. As we suggest, the two modes of thought and expression may overlap, but they are still there. For hundreds of years in England the danger lay in Temple and synagogue

endeavouring to destroy one another, instead of mutually assisting one another. The problem has not been solved yet, but since the Great War much of the sting has gone out of it. Both Temple and synagogue, both Anglican and Puritan, have in the past days of their power been bitter, and harsh, and cruel. Says Wesley, "In spite of all the prejudices of education I could not but see that the poor Nonconformists had been used without either justice or mercy; and that many of the Protestant Bishops of King Charles had neither more religion nor humanity than the Popish Bishops of Queen Mary." True, though perhaps a little overstated. But when the Parliament of 1664 passed the Conventicle Act, whose example were they following? Cromwell's. And when in the next year they added to their persecution of Dissenters by passing the Five Mile Act, with whose heifer were they ploughing? Again, Cromwell's.

It all dates from those Tudor times when the Bible was translated into the vulgar tongue and the people allowed free access thereto, from the times when the Old Book became the library of every Englishman who could read, and when the illiterate habitually thronged round the man who could spell out the Sacred Page. The Bible was once the most popular Book in England. It is still the "best seller."

Two types of thinker began to emerge. The one had a reverence for the past history of both church and nation. Ever since the time of Christ there had been an outward and visible Church, and a succession of ministers ultimately deriving their authority from the Apostles. This Church had sunk to a low level, it had terribly needed reform, but it had been reformed. The last steps of this nature had been taken in Elizabeth's reign. The old Church of England, which had existed long before any Romish missionary had been heard of in this country, and which had been submerged under Romish rite and foreign custom, emerged yet once again, purified in doctrine and ritual. Her credal base was broad enough for all reasonable men, her final authority in all matters of faith and practice the Holy Writ which she

urged her people to study for themselves. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

The other type of individual, accepting the last quoted phrase with a perhaps unstudied eagerness, drew from it the inference that as long as the Holy Scriptures were in the hands of the laity, the church of the past could now go. With the Bible in their midst, the church consisted merely of congregations of persons assembled for prayer and for Bible study. Each such congregation constituted a church. There was no longer need for Bishop or Priest. With the Scripture as its text-book and with Christ present when two or three of His people were gathered together the church was always and everlastingly starting again. The authority of the past was nil. It is perfectly obvious that this mode of thought was bound to affect a man's political belief. Looking directly to Christ as King, and believing Him to be present at their gatherings, the authority of their earthly monarch loomed less and less before them, and they began to speculate as to the possibility of assemblies of Christian men ruling the nation without any visible head at all. In other words they tended to become Republicans. What happened in Cromwell's time we know. A number of them in Stuart times emigrated to America and their tenets in due course produced their logical result. In Hanoverian days their theory developed into practice. They became outwardly what they had always been inwardly. The Republic of the United States of America came into being, causing a breach in Israel. The question of taxation, in which the motherland was morally and constitutionally in the right, was merely a convenient excuse for the explosion. Any other would have done. Hanoverian Americans cut loose from the comity of Israel because some Tudor Englishmen whose descendants had emigrated there had held an unbalanced theory of religion.

The logical outcome of such theories had been patent to the astute mind of Elizabeth, and her judgment has been absolutely vindicated by the conduct of America.

Of course this Puritanic trend towards republicanism had its reflex effect upon Anglicanism, and tended to make

the English Church, at certain epochs, monarchical to the point of lunacy. The divine right of kings—and no British-Israelite can say that our kings do not possess a peculiar divine right, particularly when they happen to be ruling rightly—was held to apply not merely to the regal line, but to the actual individual occupant of the throne, even when ruling wrongly. Hence the blather of James I, and the execution of Charles I. A moonstruck Anglicanism and a mad Puritanism centre round his scaffold, and make pandemonium. We shall hereafter see that when, before 1702, and in preparation for the era that 1702 ushered in, the question of the continuance of the Royal House had to be settled upon the only stable basis, it was settled in the manner indicated above. The line was kept. The individual monarch was changed. Furthermore, so deeply was Republicanism in the very blood of masses of the nation that one of the chief causes which led to the acceptance of William of Orange as King in England lay in the fact that he had been the blameless Stadtholder of a Republic in Holland.

From Tudor times England was divided between the Anglican, with his Temple religion and his monarchical sympathies, and the Puritan (Presbyterian or Independent) with his synagogue religion and his republican leanings. Behind both loomed the terror of Rome. And only this external terror could ever force Anglican and Puritan to forget their differences, and become Englishmen.

Now let us boldly face the question as to why Rome should not have been permitted to triumph, to assert her sway over the whole of Europe, and to draw us and our neighbours across the channel into one comity of nations, ruled over by the alleged Vicar of the Prince of Peace. Why should not the League of Nations have been anticipated a little ?

There are two reasons why this should not have taken place. In the first place, Rome as a church is an apostate church. It is no pleasure to criticise the beliefs of other people, but when one meets with merely flagrant idolatry in Mass and image worship ; with penance and confession

and priestly absolution substituted for repentance, conversion, and Christ's absolution, the matter speaks for itself. Rome appeals to the senses. Christ pierces to the heart. Rome is a wonderful and skilful travesty of spiritual religion. Christianity is spiritual religion. It is the first province of Israel to spread Christianity, and the Romish travesty thereof is of no use to us.

In the second place, Rome Papal is the bastard child of Rome Imperial. The old emperors conquered these realms with the sword, and held them like men. Daniel refers to Imperial Rome as a beast, and no doubt the term is a very fitting one. But it was a courageous beast which, through long periods of history, ruled with a rough justice, giving blows and taking them. Rome Papal had all the ambition of the beast, without the hardihood. It would still reign over the nations from the seven hills, not by the conflict of brave men with brave men, but by the infiltration of superstitious fools by subtle priests, who traded on their terrors. Of all means of carrying on government the Purgatory and excommunication business is about the most slimy.

Imperial Rome degenerated down the ages until she became Papal Rome. A lion was replaced by a venomous serpent. But the serpent only had the right of access, speaking from the standpoint of Prophecy, to the dominions of the beast to which he had succeeded. And England was not one of them.

This is the very crux of the matter. In so far as these dissenters of the Italian Mission are Christians, as we bear them witness that many of them are, they can still find a far purer form of Christian faith than that to which they are now attached. In so far as they hold allegiance to the Papacy, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, the prophetic successor of the Roman Emperor, has no jurisdiction within these realms and no authority over any occupant of these realms. That authority was wholly, absolutely, and finally surrendered by the Emperor Honorius in 410. To quote from Gibbon, "The independence of Britain . . . was

soon confirmed by Honorius himself . . . Britain was irrecoverably lost. But as the emperors wisely acquiesced in the independence of a remote province, the separation was not embittered by the reproach of tyranny or rebellion ; and the claims of allegiance and protection were succeeded by the mutual and voluntary offices of national friendship." * Ransom states, "after withdrawing their legions from Britain, the Romans released the Britons from their allegiance." Gardiner says, "From this time Britain ceased to form part of the Roman Empire." Hume concurs generally with the above statements, but adds, "At the prayer of the Britons, the island was visited once more (A.D. 418) by the Roman legions, on the occasion of a new inroad by the Picts and Scots ; but after repulsing the enemy, repairing the British fortresses, and instructing the natives how to make and use the arms necessary for their defence, they took their final leave." Lastly, in the reign of the Emperor Anthemius, many years later, the Britons voluntarily raised 12,000 auxiliaries for the Imperial service in France. "Riothamus, one of the independent chieftains of the island, was persuaded to transport his troops to the continent of Gaul."

Because in 1914 the Czar mobilised for the assistance of Serbia we are not to assume that he regarded himself as Emperor of the Serbians. Because a few days later English troops hurried to France to the assistance of the French army the occasion was other than a humble belief on the part of King George V that he held his throne as a fief from the President of the French Republic. And these two incidents exactly illustrate the relationship between Britain and Rome after 410. On an invasion of the Picts the Britons sought the aid, and obtained the aid, of a foreign power to whom they owed no more obedience than Serbia did to Russia. This friendly power did its kindly work, and then peaceably and immediately withdrew from a territory to which it laid no claim. In the reign of Anthemius British troops were rushed over to France for

* The reader is referred to the concluding pages of Ch. XXXI of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

the same reason that they were rushed over in 1914, because there were hostile forces marauding in the provinces pertaining to our friend the Governor of France, who happened at that time to be the Roman Emperor. In the year 410 the relationship hitherto existing between Britain and Rome completely and finally altered. The Roman province had at one bound become the Roman ally, completely independent, completely sovereign within her own territory. And this with the goodwill of the Emperor. Thereafter there only occurred certain military courtesies such as one sovereign power may render to its equal without losing its equality.

We ask our readers seriously to ponder this fact. Many students of prophecy obstinately cling to the view that England is still prophetically included within the Roman Empire, when a slight acquaintance with Gibbon, the historian who is often wrong on a theory but has never yet been proved to be in error over a fact, would have assured them that the full and solemn restoration of liberty and sovereignty to these realms had been made by the reigning Emperor, made with deliberation and finality. Had it been merely a case of a revolted province taking the opportunity to break away from a harassed government there might have been something in the view upon which these friends lay so much emphasis. That it was not a case of this type is conclusively proved by the fact that in 418 the Emperor, no longer lying under the same stress, was able to send a strong force to the relief of Britain, but never used the said force, helpless as we then were, to retain the revolted province. He acted thus because our liberty had been given back to us in full measure, as a concession never to be resumed. Never for the last 1,500 years has Rome had any rightful authority on English soil. Neither the honest Roman centurion nor his less desirable successor the Romish priest has had any legal or moral right to trouble our countryside since Honorius' day. This is the prime fact which *from the prophetic standpoint* we must keep continually before us in reviewing the course

which our ancestors have been divinely led to pursue in relation to Rome.

Within a few years of 1260 the English became restive as regards the Papacy, and, as we remarked at an earlier page, from this time the Pope's overlordship was finished with. In 1325 Wycliffe was born, and in due time the Lollards gave Rome her first shaking from what may be termed the theological side. In the reign of Henry VIII the ecclesiastical reformation took place which ended in the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope (a different matter from the overlordship) in these realms being wholly annulled. In the reign of Edward VI the religious reformation took place, which started the Church of England afresh on its course, now cleansed from Romish doctrine and somewhat Puritan in tone. A slight lapse under Queen Mary counts for nothing, except in so far as it gave Rome further opportunity for making herself hateful and hated.

Queen Elizabeth, Protestant and Reformer, restored the Church once again, not exactly perhaps on the lines of her brother, but as the Church which we know, Catholic, Protestant, Reformed. * A church of which a Wesley could be a faithful minister is a church sufficiently broad in its basis to contain within its four walls the most vitally and fervently evangelistic persons, which is perhaps the really essential thing. The Temple worship can be a means of grace to a man of grace, and Wesley has recorded the fact that a voluntary on a church organ was once the means of great blessing to his soul. And as regards the outward forms of things he has written, "It is plain even outward humiliation has been a means of outward blessings." In the Anglicanism of the Elizabethan settlement the ancient pre-Romish church of these islands still lives, and in Anglicanism the most fervidly sincere and spiritual Christians have had their spiritual home. It was not an Anglican but an out-and-out dissenter who recently remarked to us that "In any town or village in England where the Anglican clergyman is a really spiritual man he can snap his fingers

* The opposite of Catholic is heretic, and of Protestant, Romish. The Eastern Churches are, unhappily, not reformed.

at dissent. He looms head and shoulders above all the dissenting clergy in the place." The accent lies on the phrase "really spiritual."

It may be that the race is divided into two classes, the greater part of whom find a liturgical worship a real help, and the lesser part of whom find it a real hindrance. Both Temple and synagogue will remain, we suppose, until the end of time. However this may be, Anglicanism represents a form and mode of worship sufficiently national, and her greatest enemy is Rome, that external continental power which, having no rightful authority in her territory in matters either spiritual or temporal, has continually set herself to disturb her in her lawful possessions, partly through the proselytising efforts of Romish priests; partly through skilfully corrupting her until large masses of her clergy hold, teach, and practise dogmas, doctrines, and ceremonies inconsistent with their profession as priests of a church which is Catholic, Protestant, and Reformed.

At the time of the accession of Charles II we find the nation divided into Anglican and Puritan, the former intensely monarchical and unspeakably outraged by the execution of Charles I, the latter inclined to be republican and somewhat disposed to pride itself upon the same dire deed. Behind both there is the shadow of Rome. Moreover, under the rule of Cromwell possibly as many as two thousand Anglican parishes had been handed over to the care of Puritan ministers, nominated by Cromwell's "triers," never having received episcopal ordination.

The first effort of Anglicanism was to purge itself of these persons. The conduct of the Puritans towards the Royal house and the established church had been such as to arouse a lust for persecution in the breasts of the Anglican party. The first parliament of Charles II was returned in such a perfervid atmosphere of loyalty that it can only be described as more loyal than the King. By an Act of Uniformity, passed in 1662, all holders of benefices were required to be ordained by a bishop. Six months were given for compliance.* In case of non-compliance, they

*In the case of Bartholomew Wesley, son of Sir Herbert Wesley,

were to surrender their livings on St. Bartholomew's Day—just before their tithes became due. The number who refused to comply was probably about fifteen hundred. The correct estimate is difficult to arrive at, both Anglicans and Nonconformists having lied so fervently about the matter.

At first sight, nothing appears to be more just and lenient than this Act. A person holding a living in the Anglican Church without previous episcopal ordination might well have been kicked out at five minutes' notice, instead of at six months' notice. He might rightly have been refused episcopal ordination, instead of having it gently pressed upon him. This is the Anglican theory, as it strongly appeals to ourselves personally. Most unfortunately, that theory has been completely shattered, not by a nonconforming historian with a bias in favour of nonconformity, but by a high church historian with a loathing for nonconformity, Lord Clarendon. He writes concerning re-ordination : " This was new, for there had been many, and at present there were some, who possessed benefices with cure of souls and other ecclesiastical promotions, who had never received orders but in France or Holland ; and these men must now receive new ordination, which had been always held unlawful in the church." The truth of the matter seems to be that, prior to 1662, Anglicanism was so much reformed that she would recognise the orders of all other reformed churches, which will account for the fact of an Archbishop of Canterbury having once given a living to a Scotch Presbyterian minister without a suggestion of " re-ordination." This is a fact which we must simply face. Having regard to the custom of the Ancient British Church, which was represented by its Bishops at the Council of Arles in 314, and whose government was obviously episcopal, the British-Israelite may indulge in momentary wonder as to whether previously to 1662 Anglicanism had not " reformed "

of Westleigh, Devonshire, and grandfather of the Samuel Wesley, whom we shall meet with in the next chapter, the ejection (from the Rectory of Catherston) was immediate. But he was in personal disfavour with the King.

itself a little too much. The plain fact of the matter is simply this, that episcopacy is not necessary to the *esse* of the Church. That it may be necessary to the *bene esse* is a fair subject for argument, and one upon which our own views are quite decided.

The expulsion of these men some of them the ablest scholars of their age, of course, added enormously to the strength of the Puritan cause outside the Church. It was not known that Charles II was a concealed Romanist, though it was known that the heir to the throne, James, Duke of York, was an avowed Romanist. They successively ruled over a Protestant nation of Anglicans and Puritans, who were collectively determined that Rome should have no further say in the affairs of these kingdoms. Both kings endeavoured in their turn to secure liberty for Romish dissenters by extending liberty to Protestant dissenters, an artful and astute move, which was only foiled by the splendid loyalty of the Nonconformists, who placed country above self. Ultimately, the Romanising House of Stuart was got rid of, and the dissenters received the just reward of their virtue by the passing of the Toleration Act under William III. After which time Anglican and Puritan could, on the whole, live alongside one another as fellow Englishmen and fellow citizens. Meanwhile, Anglican and Puritan were alike to commit some indiscretions, such indiscretions being, though serious, of a mild character when compared with those of the liege-lords, the Stuarts.

There was first an attempt to set aside the succession of James to the throne, by Act of Parliament. It was nearly successful. But a miss is as good as a mile. When that obstinate, bigoted, crass-headed, vindictive fellow came to his own, he had a lively remembrance of those dear people who had endeavoured to bar his way to the attainment of his rights.

At this point we must very briefly remind our readers of the slight changes in our constitutional procedure, chiefly inaugurated in Tudor times, which were now to cause such an upheaval in the country.

A marked event in our history was de Montfort's Parlia-

ment of 1265. In Edward I (1272) we have the first monarch who saw the value of Parliamentary government. Just about the time of the birth of Wycliffe, the House of Commons entered upon a new era. In 1322 the Parliament at York laid down the important principle that what concerns the whole realm must be treated of by a complete Parliament, which, in essence, meant admitting the Commons to a share in legislation. And, eleven years later, by the fact of the knights of the shire joining themselves to the citizens and burgesses in the House of Commons, there was conferred upon the latter House a certain prestige which proved to be of enormous utility. The year 1333 looms great in Parliamentary history.

In the stern Tudor days, power tended to centre in the person of the monarch. This was a necessity of the times, but certain precedents were set up which were made evil use of by the Stuart line which succeeded them. We need scarcely state that the bigoted and obtuse Stuarts far surpassed the brainy Tudors in the enormity of these irregularities.

Both Henry VIII and Elizabeth betrayed great astuteness in dealing with the House of Commons, this being particularly noticeable in the matter of the Monopolies, when Elizabeth, seeing the game was up, with an almost wicked adroitness placed herself suddenly at the head of the reforming party, and thanked her loyal Commons for their kindly care for the well-being of the nation at large. It was so cleverly done that she more than regained her lost popularity. On the other hand, Henry VIII could exert pressure when he conceived it wise and safe to do so. Both these monarchs saw the value of Parliamentary institutions, and never did they attempt to coerce an obstinate House when failure would have meant disaster. They were as astute as they were autocratic, and this being so, they realised the utility of the Commons, at least so far as its function as the national safety valve.* And somewhat

* Henry VIII knew how to flatter them to the top of their bent, as on the occasion when he sent a message to the House that "his crown shone with a special lustre when his faithful Commons were a-sitting."

further. But the times were such that government could ultimately lie only in an individual, not in a committee. It may be taken as certain that, after the free circulation of the Scriptures in Tudor days, the general level of intelligence in this country rose enormously, making it still more imperatively necessary that the people should share in their own government, in post-Tudor times. This ideal was not reached until the passing of the Reform Acts in 1832 and later. But until the settlement under William of Orange the ideal was not in sight. We are dealing with this question at all the greater length because, having regard to the frequency with which some alteration in our Parliamentary system tending towards democracy tallies with some prophetic date of promised blessing, we have been compelled to the belief that this system is of importance in the Divine economy as tending to the welfare of later Israel, despite our personal and conservative leaning to a contrary position. We may suggest that its benefits would not be diminished by raising the age of the voters to twenty-five years, and of the candidates to thirty-five years. Let us learn something from Rehoboam's experience.

Under the first two Stuart sovereigns, the power of the English Parliament might have been utterly destroyed, had these two persons engaged in foreign war, attached a disciplined army to their successful leadership, and then used this army to work their will upon the nation. They were providentially neither of them men of the heroic type, and Parliamentary government continued to exist in England when it had been crushed to the earth in the neighbouring countries of Europe.

Cromwell's Parliaments were farces. But his rule was such as to give our ancestors an utter loathing of the name "standing army." It was always associated in the minds of Englishmen with the judicial murder of a King, and with the iron rule of the Major-Generals. A standing army was the one tool which Charles II and James II could have used in wreaking their will upon Parliament, and the nation which Parliament represented, and it was the one toy with which they were not allowed to play. Any

troops they kept they had to pay out of their revenues as determined by Parliament, plus the annual rentals of the Crown lands, and no Parliament would pass an Act imposing military discipline in time of peace. If a soldier deserted he could only be proceeded against in the civil courts for breach of contract. If he flung the adjutant into a horse-trough, he could only be brought before a civil magistrate for assault and battery. In short, the more the signs of the times tended to a destruction of Parliamentary power, the more did sundry providences occur tending to make our Parliamentary institutions lasting in their character.

In 1685, the year of the accession of James II, England was faced with a Sovereign incurably Popish, and a people incurably Protestant. The Sovereign was momentarily popular. Many of his people had thought the Exclusion Bill a petty piece of religious persecution. He acknowledged that, save for forty members, his first Parliament consisted of such persons as he himself would have chosen. The Church was loyal to a man, and, in their dread of a resurgence of republicanism, and in their horror of regicide, were preaching such mad doctrines of divine right and of non-resistance to arbitrary power as principally deceived the individual in whose honour these songs were sung. In three short years the loyalty of the Church, of the Universities, and of the great mass of the people had been utterly undermined, and the last Popish King of England was a fugitive across the water. Such a result could only have been achieved, and was only achieved, by the Sovereign taking the one solitary course which could drive his subjects to frenzy. Millions of his subjects, with Protestantism in their very bones, had to behold their Head prostrating himself before the Pope's agent, the Universities riddled with mass-priests, and the Church of England humbled to the dust before her chief foe, the Pope of Rome. * So completely to destroy the loyalty of his people, and in so short a time, required a certain type of genius. James II had that

* To do this unfortunate gentleman justice, he had the wit to see that James was going so fast and so far that his actions would only end in further trouble for the Roman Catholics, and said so.

type of genius. To gain his own ends he utilised every doubtful precedent, Tudor and other, and, in particular, that alleged right of suspension of statutes known as the dispensing power, which, always a vague appanage of the Crown, and inevitably tending to render the work of Parliament nugatory, had certainly never been intended for such use as he made of it—to flout a nation. He further availed himself of every false judgment which venal and corrupt Courts of Law could give him. For in those days the judges were appointed, not “for life or good conduct,” but merely at the King’s pleasure. By dipping sufficiently low amongst the dregs of the legal profession, it was always possible to find some sort of a loathsome object who could be turned into a judge, and who could be depended upon to produce such a judgment as the King required, or his ministers had previously dictated.

His reign began, as we have seen, by the Puritan party playing into his hands. Instead of quietly working for the accession of Mary, wife of William of Orange, the next Protestant in legal succession, many of them had striven to force the pace by setting aside James in favour of an illegitimate son of Charles II, the Duke of Monmouth. * This ill-fated young fellow had been greatly beloved by his father, and had displayed a wonderful capacity for making himself greatly beloved by the common people. He was a Protestant. The unbalanced paternal fondness may have aroused certain ambitions in his mind. The Exclusion Bill had only been lost by Shaftesbury’s folly in substituting Monmouth for Mary as Charles’ successor. Monmouth was banished to Holland. In 1685 he came over at the head of a small force, landing in Dorset. The lower and middle classes flocked to his standard. His army of miners and weavers were beaten, after displaying almost incredible gallantry, at Sedgemoor. Monmouth was captured, and unhappily betrayed the greatest pusillanimity in face of death. Then began the military butcheries of Colonel Kirke and the civil butcheries of Judge Jeffreys. Now was the

* To strengthen their case, it was, of course, bruited about that he was not illegitimate.

time for the vindictive Stuart to return thanks for the Exclusion Bill. The corpses of the Puritans rotted in chains at every cross-road in the West Country.

They had played the wrong card, and they had lost the game. They now had to hand over the stakes. Hundreds were executed. Many hundreds were sold into slavery. Their folly had simply further aroused the monarchic loyalty of the Anglican clergy, who were now able to drive home the deadly fact that Puritanism had again proved itself merely to mean insurrection and armed resistance to the King's authority. Viewing the matter from the calm standpoint of later days, we may be thankful that Monmouth failed. Had he succeeded, with his doubtful title and his essentially unstable character, we should never have enjoyed peace in the country from that time forth. We were in due time to have a line of Protestant princes, but they were to be legitimate descendants of the Royal house. We were to enjoy our national religion, but Temple and synagogue, or church and chapel, were to exist side by side, in the enjoyment of perfect liberty. Monmouth's triumph would have meant something other than that, something that no loyal Englishman who places country first and sect after would have cared to face.

But his insurrection forms the most pathetic chapter of English history.

We think it had the effect of plunging the King still further on his wayward course. He misunderstood the expressions of loyalty which it called forth, and more than ever became confirmed in the belief that he had a nation of slaves to deal with. We further believe that it was providential, and that it made for the ultimate peace of the nation, that he should have been allowed to fill up the measure of his iniquity. We consider it fortunate that the Protestants had not, by placing the name of Mary in the Exclusion Bill, succeeded in turning it into the Exclusion Act. Had this occurred, Mary would have succeeded to the throne of Charles, and to all those doubtful privileges of the throne which must ultimately have tended to the virtual extinction of Parliamentary government, whilst James would have

been looked upon as a martyr for his faith. Three years of James at his worst procured for us that clean sweep in the method of administering the country which was to herald a new age of avowedly constitutional monarchy, an age of advancement in every realm of thought and activity. The fact of Mary's accession occurring after the Declaration of Right, and not three years before facts had determined the necessity for that Declaration, saved us from revolution at a subsequent era when we had no leisure for revolution. Prior to 1702 we were to have the Constitution of this country settled to finality. Subsequent to that date there may have been occasion for re-adjustment as regards the component parts of the governmental machine. But there has been no doubt as to who it was who governed. A constitutional monarch, reigning over a free people, ruling by the advice of ministers responsible to the Parliament which represented that people, this was the end to which our constitutional history had led, from the days of de Montfort, with unfortunate, but temporary and necessary deviations in the times of the Tudors. Which deviations, slight in their Tudor beginning, led to a wide detour in the times of their Stuart ending. And that ending was sufficiently drastic.

CHAPTER VII.

THE THIRD DAY : THE DELIVERER.

“ God sent a man before them.”—*Ps. cv, 17.*

IN these days of grace in which we are now living, with the type of universal toleration to which we are accustomed daily confronting us, those persons who have forgotten certain incidents in our national history, and who have overlooked certain elements in our constitution, may feel tempted to ask the question, “ Why was not James II wholly in the right in seeking for members of his own faith political privileges equal to those enjoyed by other of his subjects ? Does not the fact of his having sought this wise reform merely stamp him as a man much before his time, who, like other great idealists, had to suffer for his altruism ? ” Of course, the Jacobites and the Roman Catholics do say that. And, when they say it, it is made to sound very plausible.

In the first place, if James held the conviction that Anglican and Puritan Christians were unfairly persecuting Roman Catholic Christians, he, as the chief representative of the latter, should have invariably shown in his treatment of the former such an example of justice, of courtesy, of rigid honour and honesty, of subservience to his own pledged word, as would have disarmed Protestant criticism and compelled the admission that a Roman might still be a Christian and a gentleman, and that his sect might therefore be entrusted with a measure of power. His conduct in all these respects was exactly and precisely the contrary to that which it ought to have been, for the result which he had in view. In the end, he held up Roman Catholic emancipation for a century and a half. To do the Romans justice, James' conduct was not dictated from the Vatican,

or by the moderately and reasonably disposed personage who occupied the papal throne at that time, but from the Court of France, where the Jesuits then swarmed and had complete dominion. Between Louis XIV, the patron and the tool of the Jesuits, and the Pope, there was, as it happened, bitter personal animosity.

In the second place, when an Act of Parliament has been passed by Lords and Commons, and received the King's assent, it can only be altered or reversed by each of the said three estates of the realm acting in unison, not by one of them acting independently. * This, even in Stuart days, was the only way of arriving at finality. The use of the shadowy dispensing power, even at that era, could only lead to further friction, and could never bring about a final settlement. An astute Roman Catholic ruler would never have dreamt of utilising this alleged dispensing power in favour of his own fellow-Churchmen, save in the rarest instances.

In the third place, it was not the aim of the King to procure for his co-religionists a fair toleration. It was his aim to put their heels on the necks of their fellow-subjects. Three per cent. of the nation was Roman Catholic in James II's day. They were, therefore, looking at the matter from the standpoint of arithmetic only, entitled to three per cent. of the Crown patronage. If the Sovereign had made use of the dispensing power to grant commissions in the Army to Roman Catholics up to three per cent. of the total number of officers, he would have been arithmetically in the right, though constitutionally, probably, in the wrong, † and diplomatically wholly in the wrong. As a matter of fact he made the Army, such as it was, swarm with Roman Catholics, and, particularly, of course, the Irish regiments. No wonder if the Protestants wondered what these things meant. And, as with the Army, so with the remainder of the Crown services.

* A case in which an Act may be passed containing a clause empowering the Sovereign to suspend the said Act in whole or in part is not an exception to the rule, but an admission of the rule.

† It is doubtful whether the dispensing power of the Crown ever rightfully extended beyond the sphere of mercantile affairs.

Towards the Church and the Universities he used simple, undiluted, blackguardly bullying, being greatly assisted therein by Lord Chancellor Jeffreys, whom he placed over an illegal and unconstitutional court named The Ecclesiastical Commission.

In 1687 he issued, relying on the said dispensing power, a Declaration of Indulgence, suspending all laws against Romish and Protestant Dissenters alike. To have to surrender the exquisite privilege of a special cruelty towards the Protestant Dissenters, the friends of Monmouth and the Exclusion Bill, was a bitter pill to swallow, but even this was worth while if, by utilising them as a tool, the King could procure toleration for the Romanists. The trap was skilfully baited, but few of the Dissenters were caught.

In 1688 this was followed by a second Declaration of Indulgence, which was ordered to be read in all Anglican churches by the respective incumbents. The Declaration was illegal, as before. The circumstances were deliberately vindictive and humiliating. The clergy refused, practically as one man, to obey this unlawful and unchristian edict. Samuel Wesley went further. He not only failed to comply with the royal order, but preached an appropriate sermon from the text: "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

Up to this time James II had no male heir, and, bad as things might be, the nation, Whigs and Tories, were kept in check by the thought that nature would take her course, that the King would die, and be succeeded by his daughter Mary, the elder child of his first marriage, who, with her sister Anne, had been brought up as an Anglican and Protestant, and this in accordance with the strict injunction of their uncle, Charles II. Charles was resolved for diplomatic reasons to keep his Roman Catholicism from the knowledge of the nation during his lifetime, and the fact of having these two damsels, of whom one was heir-apparent to the throne, educated in the Romish Church, would have given the show away most horribly. Charles' subtle

Romish diplomacy resulted in two strongly Protestant monarchs succeeding to the Catholic James. So were matters over-ruled to the nation's ultimate benefit.

But, in the early months of 1688, it began to be rumoured that the Queen expected to become a mother. Moreover, the Jesuits seemed peculiarly and unnaturally certain that the child was to be a boy. If this prophecy were to be fulfilled, it would mean that Mary and Anne would lose all claim to a throne which would devolve by right upon the new arrival. Which new arrival, being brought up, as he would be, in the strictest sect of the Romanists, would provide a Protestant country with a fresh Roman Catholic monarch, and probably a whole line of them.

In the minds of our forefathers the national troubles were to end with the decease of James. That was the comfortable hope on which they had hitherto relied. But with the birth of a male heir they were more likely to start afresh than to show any symptoms of ending. Faces grew long.

Under these very delicate and unexpected circumstances, it was particularly necessary for James to secure the attendance of a number of the Protestant nobility and their wives in the ante-room of the Queen's chamber at the crucial moment. He mismanaged everything. By an error for which he was probably not responsible the expected date of the birth was erroneously announced. The consequence was that the Princess Anne, instead of being actually with the Queen at the time of the birth, as custom gave her the right to be, was away in the country. But the Dutch Ambassador who represented the interests of Princess Mary was not even invited to the Palace, and the rooms were packed with the representatives of the Roman Catholic party. For this James was responsible. Within a few hours of the Prince's coming into the world a strong rumour, which gathered force as it flew from mouth to mouth, was spread abroad to the effect that the Queen had never been *enceinte* at all, that a newly-born male child had been introduced into the royal bed by means of a warming pan, and that the whole^{ry} affair was a trick of the Jesuits—which

would explain their extreme positiveness as to the sex of the infant while it was yet to be.

But for the fact that Mary of Modena presented her husband with another child some years later, a child whose paternity no one had any interest in denying, the story of the warming pan would still be believed. James and the Jesuits had done everything in their power to make it credible, and it had much to do with the loss of the throne.

This event took place on the 10th June, during a time of fearful public agitation, which lasted from 22nd April to the 30th June, and which was occasioned by the Trial of the Seven Bishops.

The Second Declaration of Indulgence, of April, 1688, had brought about something more momentous in its results than a bold sermon by Samuel Wesley. It had resulted in a dignified and proper petition, signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops, being presented to the Sovereign. The burden of the petition was that the clergy might be relieved from the onus of reading the illegal and unconstitutional Declaration. The infatuated King chose to regard this petition as a seditious libel, and the bishops were committed to the Tower, and had to stand their trial. * This outrage committed upon seven distinguished Anglican prelates had the effect of producing a perfect wave of sympathy throughout the country, and by none was this sympathy more fervently displayed than by the dissenters. England was one brotherhood of trouble that day. The troops in the Tower, on guard over these venerable and persecuted persons, saw to it that no oath and no scene of drunkenness should add to the unhappiness of their prisoners' unwonted condition. And so altered was the whole atmosphere that thoughtful men exclaimed that God had permitted the bishops' imprisonment in order to save the souls of their gaolers.

On the 29th June their trial commenced at Westminster Hall. The next day they were found "not guilty." As

* The student who has not perused the Trial of the Seven Bishops in Macaulay's History has missed some of the finest pages in our historical literature.

we have no time to linger over details we shall merely refer to one speech for the defence. This was made by a young barrister of the name of Somers, afterwards to be known to history as Lord Chancellor Somers. He was at this time just rising into fame. His speech lasted seven minutes. And in the course of that seven minutes the case for the Crown was smashed.

The Crown was also smashed, for so severely was this culminating outrage, the imprisonment and trial of the Seven Bishops, felt by the leaders of the nation, that on the night of the 30th June "seven important personages, some being Whigs and some Tories, invited the Prince of Orange to land with an armed force to defend the liberties of England." James had attained to the full measure of his sin, and England was to know him and his like no more. The year 1702 was drawing nearer. Fourteen years of stern and strenuous preparation for the time of blessing were now to ensue.

Charles II had a sister, Mary, who married William II, Prince of Orange. Their child, William III, Prince of Orange, married in 1677 Mary, elder daughter of James II. "The marriage, which was to prove of incalculable importance in the future, was of great significance even at the time, and marked the end of the hostile feeling against the Dutch which, for so many years, had been the dominant note of English foreign politics." That hostile feeling was, of course, the result of jealousy of the Dutch shipping. From what branch of Israel have the Dutch descended?

William was therefore the son-in-law and the nephew of James II. He had Stuart blood in his veins, and was Stuart in his appearance. His habit of thought was autocratic. But stern training had made him in important matters a diplomat to the finger tips. Diplomatic in small matters he never was, and therefore he is to this day loathed by those fools who mistake small graces for true greatness. For instance, when setting out for the Irish Campaign, he preferred to be accompanied in his coach by a professional soldier, rather than by that hopeless fellow Prince George of Denmark, husband of Princess Anne, a military

officer of such consummate ability that even James II had had the wit to exclaim on his desertion, "What, old *Est-il-possible* gone! Well, a good trooper would have been a greater loss." As preparatory to the campaign in question, William's choice was wise. As preparatory to his return to the seat of government after the campaign, snubbing a distinguished personage was unnecessary folly. By such small indiscretions, the indiscretions of a man whose mind was always and only fixed on the main event, William succeeded in making his own path thorny, and his reputation subject to the malice of the back-biter, and the scandal of the back-stairs.

In the great issues William was a statesman through and through. And one great issue he had continually before him, the preservation of the small but wealthy Holland, with its industrious, Protestant and crowded people, from the rapacity of his neighbour, the overbearing, tyrannical, Romish Louis XIV.

Holland, or rather its Republican leaders, had displayed the greatest jealousy towards the young William, who had been early bereft of his father, and it was their determination that the office of Stadtholder should be a name and nothing else. Matters were otherwise ordered. He was called to assume his authority when little more than a lad, in consequence of a French invasion, and at a time when "nothing seemed to be left to the young Stadtholder but to perish sword in hand." From that moment of deepest distress till the day of his death he was continually occupied in one thing only, the keeping of France within her due limits. To this end he desired control of the British resources. For this purpose he married the daughter of an English King. With this in view he seized the Crown of England the first moment that it lay within his grasp. In the long last he saved Holland and England also.

The "will to rule" for the mere lust of ruling has displayed itself four times in the Europe which it was its prime endeavour to conquer and subdue. First by Spain, whose Invincible Armada was terribly handled by the Elizabethan sailors, and then destroyed by Almighty God. Then by

France, in the time of Louis XIV. Her fate was to be foiled by the English under William, and destroyed by the English under Marlborough. Then by France again, in the days of Napoleon, again to be destroyed by the English under the Duke of Wellington. A fourth appearance was in Germany in 1914, again to be crushed by the same race. Where and when is the fifth? This evil power seems continually to go eastward.

With an influentially signed request to go over to England and set the kingdom in order, and with England, weary, worn, and sad, apparently ready for the deliverer, it seems as though there were nothing for William to do but to go, and receive the plaudits. In reality he was confronted by difficulty after difficulty, each of which seemed insuperable, and many of which, to any man but William, would have been insuperable. Let us recount these obstacles.

(1) The failure of the Duke of Monmouth had proved the necessity of any future deliverer bringing trained troops with him. Undrilled volunteers, however eager, were useless. Nevertheless, the bringing of Dutch troops to England, followed by a clash with the British Army, would so arouse insular susceptibilities that nothing would be left but retreat, and, paradoxically, never would this be more the case than if the invaders proved victorious. (2) Before Dutch troops could leave the country the consent of all the component parts of the Batavian Federation would have to be obtained, including the City of Amsterdam, notoriously anti-Orange, pro-French, and therefore favourable to Louis' ally, James II. (3) Granted the aforesaid permission, Louis, as friend of the Stuarts, had merely to muster his army on the borders of Holland to keep William at home till further notice. (4) William, in forming his Grand Alliance against France, had had to utilise any power, Roman Catholic or other, who would co-operate with him. To displace a Roman Catholic Sovereign, and openly to countenance the English people in their obstinate refusal to return to the Papal fold, would therefore almost of necessity break up that Alliance on which his life-work depended. (5) The vessels containing his troops would

have to be convoyed by the Dutch Fleet. If the possibility of collision between Dutch and English troops were a contingency to be avoided, a collision between the Dutch and English fleets was a contingency to be avoided at all hazards, having regard to the jealousy inherently existent between the personnel of the two navies. The spark was there, and the magazine open. Naval affairs were the only affairs that James' limited intellect was capable of grasping, and his sailors had not forgotten that when Duke of York he had personally commanded them in victorious action against the Dutch. The slightest mishap would, in the then temper of the English navy, have brought the expedition to an end, either by the destruction of William's force before it had effected a landing, or else by such a severe defeat of the British fleet by the Dutch fleet as the British people would never have forgiven. On the other hand, to have carried over his troops without naval protection would have been tantamount to murder. William must merely take the risk, and trust God for the issue. (6) Time was necessary for the preparation of such a military force as was requisite for the occasion. It was impossible to wholly secrete the massing and the arming of such a host. This, in addition to giving Louis and James some inkling of danger, the news being simply bound to leak out over a period of months, meant that the great project could only take place in the autumn at the earliest, and subject to such weather conditions as might then obtain. Meanwhile James might make a *volte face* and regain the affections of his subjects. (7) His wife, Mary, was the daughter of the monarch whom William might be called upon to depose. What attitude would this virtuous and dutiful woman adopt, when she was thus placed in the agonising position of having to choose between her duty to her father and her duty to her husband?

He had married her because she was the only way to a throne to which he meant to attain, and which was now apparently to be thrust upon him at a date earlier than that decreed by nature. No sentiment had entered into the match. Womanlike, she had a full revenge. She made

her cold, calculating husband fall in love with her, and, years afterwards, the hour of her death was the hour of such agony to her consort as made his attendants tremble for his reason.

She was religious to the heart's core. In this she did full justice to the education which in her girlhood she had received from Bishop Compton. (When we find her writing in the fly-leaf of her Bible, "Given to William and I at our coronation," we fear that in other and more mundane respects her learned tutor had been less successful.) Bishop Compton had been unlawfully suspended from his See by the odious Ecclesiastical Commission, his sole offence being his refusal to suspend a clergyman of his diocese, who had preached against Popery, and preached against it under such circumstances that he must have done his duty or lost his soul. Mary had interceded with her father on her old tutor's behalf, and been sternly and unlovingly repulsed. James never had treated her kindly, and although he allowed her sister 30,000*l.* a year, Mary of Orange had been hard put to to maintain such an establishment and such an appearance as rightfully belonged to a Princess of the reigning house. When dealing with a woman two principles are to be borne in mind: (1) Never offend her religious susceptibilities; (2) Never be mean in the matter of her dress-money, however religious she may be. * James had done both, and his star was not in the ascendant. In any case she knew that a married woman's sole duty was to her husband. The seventh problem, therefore, solved itself. What of the other six?

They would never have been solved to this day had not the God of Israel smitten the enemies of Israel with the curse of false judgment, and had not His servant William utilised to the utmost each and every advantage which the false moves of the enemy gave him. To take them up again in order:—

(1) James had the inconceivable folly to flood England

* When there were starving families to be relieved, Mary cheerfully cut down her personal expenditure to the lowest limit compatible with the obligations of her position.

with Irish Roman Catholic troops. This so roused the gorge of the English Army that not a blow was struck in his defence. Disgusted officers deserted to William's standard in shoals, led by Churchill, the ablest of them all. (2) With amazing indiscretion, Louis seized upon this crucial moment to force two quarrels upon his friends of Amsterdam, the first concerning religion, the second concerning herrings. Many of the citizens had settled in France for purposes of trade, their Calvinistic type of Protestantism being winked at. Urged on, one supposes by the Jesuits, Louis suddenly and treacherously imprisoned these persons, and placed an embargo on the importation of those pickled herrings which they had entered his dominions to sell. In their erstwhile friend the King of France the burghers of Amsterdam suddenly recognised the Man of Sin, who persecuted the saints, and forbad the privileges of the fishmonger to all who failed to show the mark of the Beast on their foreheads. The city vote was therefore given for the employment of the Dutch troops on the English enterprise. (3, and 6) Louis did muster his forces on the Dutch frontier, and did give James notice of the threatened danger, offering his services to quench the blaze while it was yet a spark. James, somewhat cock-a-hoop, but for no conceivable reason, returned a foolish and rude answer, informing Louis that he was fully capable of attending to his own interests without external interference. (4) On the receipt of this missive Louis, disgusted with the folly and ingratitude of his ally (who was in a few months time to be a beggar dependent on his charity), removed the French army from the Dutch borders, and used it to over-run Cologne and Metz, and generally to make himself so abhorred a nuisance that one half the Roman Catholic Church would have been only too delighted to see the monster caged, even though his keeper were the Protestant William. (5) This peril was extreme: William guarded against it by placing such English-manned vessels as he had on the wing, so that if the English fleet hove in sight their vessels would be hailed by English voices. Man having done his part, God graciously did His, and the winds so blew that the Dutch and British

boats never came within gun-fire of one another. (6) After the release of the Seven Bishops, James, by way of "regain- ing the affections of his subjects," took the initial steps towards citing the ten thousand clergy who had proved recalcitrant in the matter of the Declaration of Indulgence before the Ecclesiastical Commission, thus spreading terror and dismay throughout ten thousand parishes, and com- pelling the whole of the Anglican ministry in this country to review their pet dogma of passive obedience in the calm light of clear reason and deadly funk. There were nearly ten thousand conversions that morning.

October came. Working day and night, William had been unable to be an hour earlier in the completion of his preparations. The gales were from the west. They brought fresh Irish regiments over from Dublin to Chester, and prevented William from setting sail. The wind changed, and on the nineteenth the expedition started. A violent tempest arose, and the ships were scattered. In two or three days they had reassembled, not a single soldier or sailor missing. A few horses had to be replaced. On the 1st November a second attempt was made.

The wind was easterly. For twelve hours the Prince steered north-west. Having thus given time and oppor- tunity for Dartmouth, the English admiral, to assume that Yorkshire was William's destination, the latter suddenly tacked, and went headlong down the Channel, the very breeze which was carrying him to his objective bottling Dartmouth's fleet in the Thames. This was providential, but it was masterly.

It was necessary to land at an unfortified spot, at as easterly a point as would serve. A fortification meant that collision between armed forces which must be avoided if possible, and the more westerly the disembarkation the longer the march to London and the greater the interval for James' preparation. By this time this gentleman was in a canny fit of penitence, endeavouring in three weeks to undo the mischief of three lurid years. It was too late.

Torbay was the chosen spot for William's landing. A fog came on. The pilot carried the fleet too far to the

west. To return in face of the east wind was an impossibility. Ahead lay the fortified Plymouth. Astern, Dartmouth, who had wriggled out of his bottle. A nobleman on board the Prince's vessel turned to the nearest clergyman—the delightful, brave, indiscreet, garrulous and wholly lovable Burnet—and exclaimed: “You may go to prayers, Doctor. All is over.” “*At that moment* the wind changed; a soft breeze sprang up from the south: the mist dispersed: the sun shone forth; and under the mild light of an autumnal noon the fleet turned back, passed round the lofty cape of Berry Head, and rode safe in the harbour of Torbay.”*

The troops were disembarked at Brixham. The Arminian Burnet, a civilian, risked a fearful reproof by daring to ask the Calvinistic William, a soldier, what were His Highness's next plans. But the occasion was happy, and Burnet had once laid William and Mary under deep obligation by removing a misunderstanding which had clouded their lives. William smiled. He extended his hand, and with exquisite art replied:

“Well, Doctor, *what do you think of predestination now?*”

The same Providence which had brought William to England overshadowed his work while in England. On the afternoon of the 5th November, 1688, as William chatted thus pleasantly with his chaplain, he may have thought within himself that well begun is half done, but no one realised more clearly than he the obstacles which still remained betwixt himself and the attainment of his ambition. So slow were the English gentry in rallying to the standard which they had asked him to set up that he positively threatened to withdraw to Holland and leave such lethargic folk to their fate. Owing to the belief that the landing was to have been effected in Yorkshire, they were looking for him in a wrong direction, and this initial error was soon remedied.

Even after his march across the country, and the desertion of soldier and courtier to his camp, the way was ultimately only rendered clear by the ridiculous absurdities of James. If this man had merely remained stationary, what was

* Lord Macaulay.

William to have done with him? Send his wife's father to the Tower? And on what charge? Iniquities in plenty there might have been preferred against him, but which of the King's tribunals can try the King? Cromwell's trial of Charles I was before a court unknown to this realm, a court which could only have been constituted by an unconstitutional and usurping power. William could, by usurping power, have set up such a court and beheaded his father-in-law. This would have been the Puritan era over again, one half of England, under William, at daggers drawn with the other half of England. This was the precise situation which he was called upon by the one essential necessity of his life to avoid. He must have a united England, united under himself, and united against France. He had not so much come to obtain the crown, as to obtain the forces of the crown and to hurl them against Louis. A divided England was rather worse than no England.

We have to look at the question from the point of view presented to the mind of God's human and limited instrument, William of Orange. It is precisely because he was thinking not of the welfare of Britain, but of the downfall of France, that he became, for our purposes, the excellent monarch he was, that this angular piece of monarchic ware fitted so perfectly into the Divine mosaic. Persecution of Royalist by Roundhead, or of Roundhead by Royalist, he loathed, because it perpetuated ill-feeling between two classes of persons, both of whom were requisite for the building up of the army which was to destroy Louis. Himself a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, and a Calvinist, he was ready, anxious, and zealous, for such settled religious equality between Temple and Synagogue in these realms as would conduce to that perfect peace at home which would be the best prelude to a perfect war abroad.

Had James merely remained in England this fact, without anything added thereto, would have been sufficient to baffle William's counsels. He fled. Brought back by some foolish busybodies, William saw to it that a second opportunity of escape should be granted to him, and that this opportunity should be made full use of. The Convention

declared the Crown vacant. William and Mary were elected to the vacancy, with remainder to the survivor, and the Revolution was an accomplished fact.

We had now returned in intent to our ancient monarchic system. To Serjeant Maynard, a barrister of ninety years of age, who had been presented to him, William remarked: "Why, sir, you must have survived all the lawyers of your standing." "Yes, sir, and but for Your Highness I should have survived all the laws too." This tersely expresses the whole aim of the statesmen of the Revolution, to retain the paramount position of the law, hitherto grossly flouted in its operation by monarchs who had been ecclesiastically nurtured on a foolish and mischievous misinterpretation of the Biblical teaching of the divine right. When William had been elected sovereign of this country the fact of his Parliamentary election did not avoid the possibility of a Divine election, . . . but the Parliamentary part of it was very patent to the eyes of all men, and to none more so than to the Republican Stadtholder himself. No longer could the Crown be an object of silly idolatry. To the end of time it could continue to be an object of profound respect.

The opportunity which the Revolution presented was utilised to the full, so far as the realm of constitutional law and procedure was concerned. The limits of the Royal prerogative were clearly ascertained, the dispensing power utterly done away with, and for William and his successors there no longer at any time remained the feeble excuse that they had trespassed because their bounds were indeterminate. Parliaments were to be held at regular intervals. Judges were to be appointed, not during the King's pleasure, but "for life or good conduct." In case of bad conduct an occupant of the judicial bench might be removed by the Sovereign after petition by both Houses of Parliament, but not otherwise. In the result, the judicial bench of this country has become the admiration of the world.

Parliaments, we have said, were to be held at regular intervals, so that the Crown might never again have the power of silencing oppressed subjects by refusing to call the Houses together, a favourite Stuart tactic. And this

advantage the Commons improved by voting the revenue for shorter periods. At once that House assumed a greater importance as regards the practical working of the State than had ever hitherto been the case. Here begins our modern Parliamentary system, a fact of enormous import when we consider the work to which Israel was shortly to be called. But the full essentials of the system, essentials, that is to say, when viewed in the light of our wretched human and selfish limitations, had yet to be ascertained. One thing William did not understand, and his counsellors did not understand, and that was how his free Parliaments, elected by free people, could prove themselves hopelessly refractory assemblies. It was at length discovered that when we had a Whig majority in the House, and a Tory ministry, there was chaos. Under similar circumstances, when the ministry was partly Whig and partly Tory, there was incertitude culminating in trouble. But when the ministry was wholly Whig, there was peace. And so for the other party.

At length, but later than William's era, it came to be recognised that the ministry must virtually be appointed by the voters, at any rate to this extent, that when a decided majority of one particular colour existed in the House, then the ministry must also be wholly of that colour. And so we have our present procedure. The people having elected the House and thus revealed the party majority to be found therein, the Sovereign personally, and in accordance with the dictates of his own judgment, appoints a Prime Minister, * who must be a person of such political views as those held by the said majority. The Prime Minister selects his cabinet. The Sovereign *does not*. Our actual mode of government is therefore by a dictator, the Premier. On an adverse vote of the House the dictator requests the Sovereign to dissolve the House (which constitutionally he is compelled to do, on receipt of such request); writs are issued for a new Parliament; and if the majority has changed the dictator is changed also—by the

* This functionaries' constitutional existence was not recognised until the time of Edward VII.

Sovereign acting as above. This method of changing the dictator has replaced the old one, which was by decapitation.

To the mind of William of Orange it appeared that he must be perfectly fair and impartial to both sides, that neither party had a monopoly of talent, and that his successive ministries should therefore be made up of the leaders of both the parties in the State. His system is fair, logical, and it won't work. Our present method means that at any one time one half of the political capacity of the country is out of office. It is unfair, illogical, and silly, and it will work. But at the era of stress and comparative sanity produced by the Great War we found that William's method was the statesmanlike method, and had to return to it. So soon as the peril was over, we went back to the party system. In these realms we require only one party, the British Party. This is a political grace to which we have not attained.

For the purpose of this work it is only incumbent upon us to indicate that at the accession of William III the Parliament attained such undoubted position in the State as contained within itself all the essentials for its own further and necessary evolution. The Crown reverted to its ancient and pre-Tudor position. Never since that time have we had to execute or dethrone a Sovereign. On the one occasion on which it was necessary temporarily to deprive a Sovereign of his sovereignty all could be effected by the utilisation of the powers inherent in the Parliament and the Great Seal, taken together. And on that King's happy restoration to health all went on as before. * For the work that lay before Israel after 1702 it was necessary to have such a constitution as would work with all attainable ease. The events of 1688 put matters in such admirable trim that all that has been necessary subsequently has been

* "Wednesday, 25th February, 1789, was the day which I had ordered all our brethren in Great Britain and Ireland to observe with fasting and prayer, for the recovery of His Majesty's health : But we had the satisfaction to hear, that before we asked (unless in private) He answered ; insomuch that the time intended for humiliation, turned into a time of thanksgiving."—Wesley's *Journal*.

merely to realise and to utilise the powers of the governmental machine which we already possessed.

One thing more was essential—sufficient of the Divine grace suffused through the nation as would secure a reasonable cohesion during the times when revolution was most in the air, periods like 1745 and 1789 and 1848. The Wesleyan Revival was the means of providing this Godly factor for its own and for the next generations. “Our warmest opposers,” wrote Wesley, “are the Jacobites, who do not love us, because we love King George. But they profit nothing, for more and more people ‘fear God and honour the King.’”

For certain other matters, connected with our economic well-being, the reign of William of Orange must be for ever memorable. They are (1) the restoration of the currency (1696); (2) the founding of the Bank of England (1694); (3) the establishment of the National Debt (1692). This latter has been held to be the great slur upon his career. Fools have said that the nation never was in debt till William came over, whereas the truth is that William was the first British Sovereign to arrange, not for getting into debt, but for getting out of it; not for borrowing, but for arranging to repay what he had borrowed. But we return to this in its place. Meanwhile we deal with these three great events in the order of their economic importance, which happens to be the exact reverse of their order in time.

In one of the most widely renowned Histories of England, containing 844 pages, the matter of the restoration of the currency is dismissed in three lines. In another, of 997 pages, the matter is dealt with in a dozen lines. Macaulay, who gives every question its due meed of notice, devotes practically one hundred pages to the subject. Granting that collateral questions are also to be met with in this large section of the History, the arithmetic of the matter still goes to prove how deplorably inadequate is the treatment meted by historians generally to those vital factors in our national life which, being economic, cannot be made interesting to the general public, save by the pen of genius. We

must merely do what we can, and trust to the generosity of our readers.

So terrible were the effects upon the trade and commerce of our country produced by the condition of the coinage, that in the year of reform, the year 1696, we very nearly went under. The strength of the medicine had to be proportionate to the virulence of the disease, and the two together almost killed the patient.

These matters work so smoothly nowadays that we can have no conception of the difficulties faced by our ancestors in the ordinary and common matters of everyday life. To be as brief as possible, we may simply state that in those days silver coinage was principally utilised as a medium of exchange. The coins were of two types, milled and hammered. The milled coins had a rough edge, and were not much tampered with. The hammered, on the other hand, lent themselves peculiarly to the art of the clipper. Clipping was an offence most drastically punished by the law, but the profits of the illegal trade were such that clipping went on. When it is found that one of these gentry, on conviction, was in a position to offer £6,000 for a pardon, one begins to realise what the emolument of iniquity amounted to. Moreover, the public were never really able to grasp the amount of wrong-doing evidenced by the mere clipping of a pennyworth of silver from a fat crown piece. It seemed such a small thing, and the punishment such a heavy thing, that witnesses were slow to come forward, and convictions difficult to obtain.

The result was chaos. Workmen were paid by tale, in coins which wise men dare only accept by weight, however illegal this precaution might be. A man's wages brought him just half the food, the beer, the tobacco, which he had earned. Throughout every class of society, from the House of Commons both upwards and downwards, there were then, as there are now, blockheads who were unable to understand that a silver coin, stamped one shilling when it left the mint, could ever come to be less than a shilling in value. Throughout every class of society there were men who realised that whatever you called the thing one actual

value only could it possess—its present value. Of the latter were Somers (whom we have heard of before), Locke, Sir Isaac Newton, and Montague.

The simplest solution of the difficulty was Locke's suggestion, that a Royal Proclamation should fix a near date after which hammered money should in all cases pass by weight. This would have gone straight to the heart of the difficulty, but it would have been grossly unfair to those persons who had innocently and helplessly come into the possession of clipped coin. It was felt that the loss should fall upon the whole community. That loss could not be less in the aggregate than £1,200,000, an enormous sum in those days.

It was resolved that all new coinage should be milled ; that persons bringing in the old coinage should as soon as possible be paid in the new, *not by weight but by tale*, the loss thus falling entirely on the country ; that after a certain date hammered money should not pass at all, thus ensuring that all the old and hammered coins would be surrendered ; and that the new milled coinage should be of the one old standard of weight and fineness.

It sounds all right on paper. What it meant was that for months in the year 1696 our ancestors had to get on in their commercial matters as they could, using what few milled coins they had, giving I.O.U.'s on their personal credit to butcher and baker and candlestick maker, and even returning to barter if they could find someone willing to exchange commodities. For recoinage takes time, and though Sir Isaac Newton set up extra mills at Bristol and elsewhere it was not till the month of August that the new money began to find its way back into circulation in any marked manner. The agony had lasted from the 4th May. It was during this time that Exchequer Bills, drawn for various amounts from £100 down to five pounds, and bearing interest at the rate of threepence per day per hundred pounds, first made their appearance. Without these Bills, the government of the country could not have been carried on that year. And throughout that year of acute distress there was a reasonableness, a patience, a kindliness,

a brotherliness, manifested throughout the country between man and man which some persons said must have been, and could only have been, of Divine origin. This spirit only saved us from riot, perhaps from revolution.

After August, 1696, the country entered rapidly upon a period of great economic prosperity. The vital question of the currency had been settled for all time.

The founding of the Bank of England in 1694 was due to a Scotsman. Hitherto the only class of persons answering at all to the modern bankers were the goldsmiths, who used to receive the loose cash of the merchants, store it in their strong rooms, and carry on, to a limited extent, the operations of a banking house. Such small facilities as these persons could render their clients were inadequate to the necessities of the times. The nation had outgrown the system, if system it may be called. The goldsmiths have as much relation to the modern banking houses as the barber surgeons have to the modern Fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons. To this day many persons believe the Bank of England to be a government institution. It is a private institution carrying on the Government's financial business. As regards the public, it derives its extreme importance, we suggest, from the fact of its always acting as treasurer to the Joint Stock Banks * with whom the public customarily deal directly. It is the Bankers' Banker. Which, of course, does not mean that it is not also open for the transaction of the ordinary business of a Banker, thus occasioning great jealousy in the breasts of the descendants of the aforesaid Joint Stock Companies, who regard the existence of the Head Office of the Bank of England as an unmitigated blessing, an undoubted and vital necessity, and the existence of its local branches (at Liverpool and elsewhere) as a matter for cursory ejaculation, not always of the most refined type.

William Paterson, who first (in 1691) brought forward the scheme for the founding of the Bank of England, was a gentleman of varied and dubious career. Little was known of him save that he had been to the West Indies, but whether

* Now "The Big Five."

as missionary or as pirate was a point upon which no two men could agree. Banks already existed at Venice, Genoa, Amsterdam, and Hamburg. The occasion which led to the success of Paterson's scheme lay in the vital necessity of finding the funds for the war with France. Hitherto the Chancellor of the Exchequer had had to go, hat in hand, on to the Exchange, and haggle with individual goldsmiths, borrowing £100 here and £200 there. It was essential that the Government should have one great lending house to appeal to. Hence the origin of this great and vital factor in our economic prosperity. It early proved its usefulness, and on a dozen occasions. For instance, the restoration of the currency was only carried out through the Bank of England lending to the nation the £1,200,000 which had been lost to the nation through the devilish arts of the clipper, and also with the help of certain other temporary schemes carried out by the same Bank which had as their object the relieving of the dreadful situation occasioned by the four months' lack of currency. Here, again, we find something arising in the reign of William which contained within itself all the essentials of its own future evolution, something the powers of which had merely to be tested in the days of later strain, and which, the more it has been tested, has all the more proved itself adequate to the economic necessities of a nation of which William's England was only the germ. For the present ease with which you carry out the financial details of your business, for the realised possibilities of increased trade and enlarged commerce, thank God for Paterson, for William of Orange, and for the Parliament of 1694.

And now for a paragraph with reference to the National Debt.

If a kite has no tail it flies wildly. If it is all tail it won't fly at all. If it possesses a tail exactly adjusted to its requirements it will maintain its position in the strongest gale. Commerce is the kite. The National Debt is the tail.

A National Debt might be of such dimensions that it would crush the State, or the State might have to avoid this disaster by repudiating the debt. Which act of

spoliation and bankruptcy would, of course, crush the individual creditors of the State. The State being compounded of individuals the result would in any case be disaster of a type, and of a terribly serious type.

But just suppose a contrary set of circumstances. Suppose the State so wealthy that it could immediately proceed, and did immediately proceed, to pay off our National Debt of six thousand millions. What would ensue? Such plethora of money as would render all money valueless. Instead of the present comfortable £4 15s. per cent. or so which you derive from your Local Loans, you would be thankful to be certain of 5s. per cent. from any reasonable security. But you couldn't live on 5s. per cent.; you couldn't do it now, much less then, when we suppose the excess of monetary resources would be so great that a bone collar stud would cost a sovereign.

There is a mean between these two extremes, a mean when the National Debt is of such dimensions that we can, nationally, afford interest and sinking fund, but when the national resources are such that that interest is naturally of such a rate as enables a plain man to live on the interest of a sound investment. Previous to William's reign such investment could only be found in a mortgage on land. Subsequent to that reign it could be found in a government security. We lay the accent on the word security, because that was the accent which William laid. Previous to his time there was no provision for eventual payment of Crown Debts. He made them National Debts, and for their ultimate repayment there is mortgaged *the credit of the Nation*.

This, then, is what the reign of William meant for the period subsequent to William, the period in which we live. It meant (1) such sound and sufficient currency as enabled the retail side of trade to proceed without a hitch. (2) Such an excellent banking system as enabled the wholesale side of trade to proceed without a hitch. (3) Such a sound investment for his old age as urged the trader to make use of every opportunity for the acquisition of that wealth, the continued and uninterrupted enjoyment of which was

now assured to him. Under such circumstances England, after 1702, had nothing to do but to go on going on. It did.

We have spoken of the reforms in the government, and of the reforms in finance, which mark this reign. There was no reform in morals, and at the very time, subsequent to 1702, when Israel ought to have started for Heaven, she appeared to be going headlong to Hell. Unless God had sent a prophet, to whom His people listened, this would have been the inevitable result of His economic blessing, unaccompanied by spiritual blessing of equal intensity.

Samuel Wesley was a strange fellow. He was a most God-fearing man, a deep student of the Word of God, and an exceedingly conscientious clergyman. But he had a kink. Finding that his wife retained some Jacobitish notions he left his domicile, and refused to return to the lady until she was able to join with fervour in her husband's prayers for King William. King William died, a comparatively young man, in 1702, worn to a shadow by the responsibilities and the turmoils of his career. The cause of domestic dissent being now removed, Samuel returned home. William of Orange had to die in 1702 that John Benjamin Wesley might be born in 1703.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT : JOHN WESLEY.

“ He was a good man, full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.”—*Acts xi*, 24.

TO endeavour to give any adequate portraiture of this saint, scholar, preacher, ruler, philanthropist, diplomatist, evangelist and reformer in the space of two short chapters is merely to court disaster, and to invite a justly deserved ridicule. But, if our book is to be in any sense complete, and yet not of inordinate length, it is a fate we cannot avoid. There were other religious leaders and soul-stirring preachers in his day, Whitefield for instance. But Wesley simply towers above the rest. As his century recedes and we are able to obtain an ever-increasing accuracy of perspective the more do we see that that pivotal century is, from the religious standpoint, wholly dominated by one wholly devoted superman, John Wesley.

To this day the man is not popular. The world never has, and never will have, any use for a man who rebuked sin, whether of omission or of commission, as Wesley rebuked it.

For an assembly of saints, who literally wallowed in "gospel teaching," and felt particularly cocksure about their own personal salvation, to be told that unless they literally fulfilled all righteousness they were destined for the hottest part of the nethermost hell, was cruelly disconcerting, especially as the fellow seemed actually to believe what he was saying. How if it were true?

And here we are trenching upon the cause of Wesley's lasting unpopularity amongst evangelical church-people. He was an out-and-out Arminian. Grace he held was free, for all men. But men were free too. If a believer deliberately apostatized he was at liberty to apostatize. There was no such thing as the "final perseverance" of the saints. There was the imminent possibility of the final damnation of the saints. The Calvinistic formula "once in grace always in grace" was devil's dope for stupefying souls. This wakening doctrine was not popular with those to whom it was applied. Wesley's lash stung. Now, though his evangelical opponents would have looked on with the greatest complacency whilst that lash fell upon the shoulders for whom it was Calvinistically intended, upon the publicans and the sinners, certain Pharisees howled when a few well-directed cuts gave acute and unexpected anguish to their own portly persons.

Wesley mercilessly insisted upon bringing the light of his clear logic to bear on the Calvinistic position in respect to election and reprobation. If, he stated, a man were Divinely fore-ordained to damnation it was useless and cruel to preach to him salvation. And if he were fore-ordained to salvation it was more useless still, because being destined to that end, at that end he would arrive, preaching or no preaching. All preaching to the unconverted was therefore, on the Calvinists' own showing, sheer waste of energy, so why did they preach? In the long last Wesley has achieved a very considerable victory even amongst the Calvinists themselves, for though the evangelical party in the Church is much permeated with Calvinistic thought, there are very few of their number who now hold to the doctrine of reprobation, and the question of election has been watered

down to that of "election for service" merely. There remains a mutilated Calvinism, just so far linked with its own past history as to look upon Wesley with a puzzled wonderment slightly tintured with an unacknowledged dislike. This dislike is chiefly evidenced by the extraordinary ignorance displayed by the average Churchman concerning the tenets and the career of the greatest presbyter which the Church of England has ever produced.

The comfortable doctrine of final perseverance these brethren still cling to. The uncomfortable doctrine of a certain, divinely decreed and inescapable damnation for an enormous multitude of the human race they have, for the most part, quietly shelved. They have come to see, as Wesley very early saw, that such teaching strikes at the root of all possible reasoned belief in God. They therefore no longer teach it, and as regards the majority, no longer hold it. But Wesley was the fierce and terrible opponent of those from whom they claim descent, and his name is suspect. The suspicion is not acknowledged, but it is there. The evangelicals are faced with the memory of the greatest evangelist who has ever lived since the days of St. Paul, and in matters of the first import they have to acknowledge that their forebears were in angry and not over successful feud with this same lucid, trenchant, unpleasant personage. As the fact cannot be explained away, let it be ignored, and Wesley also.

For those who desire to dispel this cloud of ignorance we suggest the perusal of two works, Southey's *Life of Wesley* and Wesley's *Journal*. Of all biographies of Wesley, we particularly commend Southey's, because, not being a follower of Wesley's, he may be described as the onlooker who sees most of the game. There is no personal bias to prejudice the judgment of the biographer, a fact which might conceivably be true of other able productions. In one point, Southey erred, but lived to acknowledge his error. He had attributed to Wesley a personal ambition with which he cannot in fairness be charged. For the rest, his is a thoughtful, careful, laborious compilation, full of interest in the perusal, and compact with information. As

a boy he had seen Wesley on more than one occasion, and had been struck with the fresh youthful complexion which still characterised him in extreme old age. But perhaps Wesley never was old !

The British-Israelite who sets himself to the instructive task of studying Southey will find his interest strongly aroused ere he reaches the subject matter of the book. At an earlier stage in the present work we have had to make reference to Sharon Turner, the scholarly historian whom our opponents are compelled, in sheer self-defence, to belittle. Now, remembering in what estimate Southey held his *Life of Wesley* when regarded in its relative order of importance as contrasted with other of his own works, it is illuminating to be faced with the fact that Robert Southey, D.C.L., Poet Laureate, one of the most deservedly appreciated authors of his own day, could find no worthier recipient for the dedication of this favourite book than his esteemed friend Sharon Turner. This, remember, is the deliberate judgment of a contemporary ; Southey could afford to be independent in his choice in conferring the honour, and he chose Turner for the highest honour which he, as a foremost writer, had it in his power to bestow.

Before we come to Wesley's *Journal*, we are going to place before our readers a short summary of the earlier part of his life. A few excerpts from the *Journal* will follow, and will lead naturally to the consideration of the distinctive doctrines the heralding of which was the great business of his career. Which doctrines, steadfastly maintained, nevertheless received certain commendable modifications as years and experience brought added wisdom. As the years elapsed Wesley was to deepen, to broaden, and to mellow, without the loss of one iota of moral force or spiritual fervour. Finally, we shall note how this spiritual fervour had been communicated under the providence of God, from man to man, until it had run through the English-speaking world, even in Wesley's lifetime.

John was the second surviving son of Samuel and Susannah Wesley. He was born at Epworth on the 17th June, 1703. Samuel Wesley held the livings of Epworth and Wroote.

He is chiefly remembered as the author of a heavy and learned tome on the Book of Job, which was dedicated to Queen Caroline. As a young man he had, we believe, offered himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury as a missionary to the Turks, such an offer as it was impossible to accept at that period. Coming of a line of Nonconformist ministers, Samuel Wesley became early in life a convinced Churchman. A similar course had been followed by Susannah Wesley, who was the daughter of Dr. Annesley, a Nonconformist minister. In her early teens this strong-minded young person had examined the whole case of the Nonconformists as against the Church, had decided in favour of the Church, and had joined the Church. She understood Greek and Latin and was well-read in theology. A most remarkable lady, a fond but strict mother, keeping her household in wonderful order and rearing her children in so kindly but so firm a fashion that they had reason to rise up and call her blessed. She personally attended to the education of each child, which began on the fifth birthday, by learning the alphabet in one day. Both parents were excellent disciplinarians. When Wesley was eighty-six he wrote, "I spent an hour at Mr. Smith's, in Cudsdem. He has ten children, from eighteen to a year or two old ; but all under government. So that I met the very picture of my father's family."

Owing to Samuel Wesley's fervent denunciation of the wrong-doing of certain of his parishioners, he had incurred the hatred of a pack of blackguardly scoundrels, who made three revengeful attempts to burn down Epworth Rectory. The third, on the 9th February, 1709, was successful. No lives were lost, but John, then a little boy of six, was only saved by some of the bystanders forming a human ladder in the total absence of a timber one, and rescuing the youngster just the very second before the roof fell in. That second altered the history of England. The memory of this deliverance remained with him throughout his days, and he regarded himself as "a brand plucked out of the burning." On the 9th February, 1750, he wrote, "We had a comfortable watch-night at the chapel. About eleven

o'clock it came into my mind that this was the very day and hour in which, forty years ago, I was taken out of the flames. I stopped, and gave a short account of that wonderful providence. The voice of praise and thanksgiving went up on high, and great was our rejoicing before the Lord."

In 1714 he was sent to the Charter-house, where, under the system of bullying then prevalent, he seems to have had a thin time, and this rather literally. During part of his residence, his only daily diet was a small portion of bread, the meat having been stolen by his seniors. He seems to have been a plucky and athletic little chap, every day, in accordance with his father's advice, making it a practice to run three times round the Charter-house garden, a fact to which he subsequently attributed his length of days and his elastic constitution. In 1720 he proceeded to Christ Church, Oxford, having obtained a scholarship of £40 a year. At Oxford he was particularly noted for his skill in logic, and gained a general reputation as a cheerful, witty, vivacious young fellow.

When the time for taking Orders drew nearer, prolonged correspondence took place between the youth and his parents as to the advisability of the step. Wesley read Thomas à Kempis, and was little helped by the perusal. His mother's opinion of the work coincided with his own, but Samuel Wesley entered a protest on behalf of an old literary favourite. John then turned his attention to Bishop Taylor's *Holy Living*, which book produced an almost miraculous effect upon his life. From the time he conned this work, at twenty-two years of age, is to be dated his real conversion, so far as it is humanly permissible to judge of such things. Sixty years afterwards he himself described this as the period "when it pleased God to give me a settled resolution to be not a nominal, but a real Christian." If this is not conversion, we are ignorant of the meaning of the term. We emphasise the point, because some Wesleyans, erroneously, as we submit, date this event thirteen years later. "Instantly," said Wesley, "instantly I resolved to dedicate *all* my life to God, *all* my thoughts and words and actions, being thoroughly convinced there was no medium." Excellent,

save that Wesley was seeking sanctification before quite realising the grounds of justification. This seems to have been the settled mental habit of his friend and senior, William Law.

On one point he differed from the great Taylor. The bishop had affirmed that we know not whether God has forgiven us. The disciple demurred. He observed, "I am persuaded that we may know if we are *now* in a state of salvation, since that is expressly promised in the Holy Scriptures to our sincere endeavours." Wesley was right to this extent, that the Scriptures "expressly promise" that "when the wicked man turneth away from the wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." But it is a stony path, and Wesley was to test this for himself, over long years of the sincerest and most legalistic "endeavours."

He was ordained Deacon on the 19th September, 1725. In the following March he was elected Fellow of Lincoln College, to the unbounded satisfaction of his now aged father. "What will be my own fate before the summer is over, God knows. . . . Wherever I am, my Jack is Fellow of Lincoln." As a sequel to the Fellowship there followed his appointment as Greek Lecturer and Moderator of the classes. The latter position gave him unique opportunity for increasing his facility in logic and debate, weapons which were to be used with such marked effect in the unhappy but enforced controversies of his later days. Many a wounded Romanist or Calvinist, suddenly and unexpectedly prinked through a chink in his armour, had cause heartily to curse these debating classes at Lincoln.

It would appear that his sole practical experience of the ordinary parochial life of the clergy occurred between August, 1727, and November, 1729, during which period he was away from the University in order that he might assist his father by undertaking the curacy at Wroote. Whilst acting in this capacity, on the 22nd September, 1728, he was ordained Priest, and his temporary absence from Oxford was rendered for ever memorable by one other incident. Having one day travelled many miles to see a

“serious man,” this person said to him, “Sir, you wish to serve God and go to heaven. Remember, you cannot serve Him alone: you must therefore *find* companions or *make* them: the Bible knows nothing of solitary religion.” In this sentence lies the germ of all the Methodist Societies. The seed fell upon good ground.

Returning to Oxford, he found companions. The first Methodist Society had formed itself.

Whilst John was at Wroote, a great change had taken place in his younger brother Charles, a Christ Church student who had hitherto proved somewhat untractable to his senior’s admonitions, and had very definitely demurred to “becoming a saint all at once.” Charles was unable to trace the source of this change in his own character, and could only attribute it to the unconscious influence of his mother’s prayers. “Meeting two or three undergraduates, whose inclinations and principles resembled his own, they associated together for the purpose of religious improvement, lived by rule, and received the sacrament weekly.” An indication of the low religious condition of Oxford at that time is to be found in the fact that it was customarily through a ridiculing crowd that they had to shoulder their way to St. Mary’s for their weekly communion. They were called the Sacramentarians, the Bible-bigots, the Bible-moths, the Holy Club, the Godly Club. It was said that a new sect of Methodists had arisen. The name stuck.

They were a band of High Churchmen, devoting every moment of their time to working out their own salvation—and finding it a very dismal process—by prayer, almsgiving, visiting the prisoners and the poor, Bible study, fasting, the Holy Sacrament, meditation, and morbid self-introspection. But for their intense and pathetic earnestness one half of it would have been nearly as ridiculous as their fellow-students thought the whole of it. Such unnatural habit of life is directly condemned by the New Testament, is dishonouring to the Giver of all good things, and is not a *régime* adapted to the production of a sound and healthy Englishman. The first business of a University student is to obtain the whole benefit of his University career, so that

he may enter upon his subsequent course with a firm belief, a well-stored mind, and a muscular athletic frame. To this end he must lead a balanced and ordered life, with proper exercise for soul and mind and body. The lives of the Methodists were ordered to the last second, but they were not balanced. The soul was pampered, the mind was fed, the body starved. William Morgan and John Wesley were their leaders. Morgan died in 1732, worn out, and mentally under a cloud. Wesley began to spit blood, was awakened one night by the breaking of a blood-vessel, and had a narrow escape of his life.

Amongst the members of the Holy Club may be mentioned John Clayton, subsequently Chaplain of Collegiate Church, Manchester, and afterwards Fellow; Benjamin Ingham; John Ganbold, afterwards a Moravian Bishop; James Harvey, author of the "Meditations"; Thomas Broughton, Secretary (1743) of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; and, of course, George Whitefield. Their numbers were at one time as high as twenty-seven, but they subsequently dwindled. After years of hard work and severe asceticism, Wesley himself seems to have been disappointed in the permanence of the results obtained, and was not altogether sorry to leave Oxford. The Holy Club should always be mentioned with a measure of respect, and, had the knowledge and discretion of the members been in accordance with their zeal, that respect must have been profound. There is an old proverb about grey heads and green shoulders, which perhaps has a kindly applicability in this connection.

Wesley's next scene of activity lay in Georgia, whither he went to serve as Chaplain to the newly-formed English Colony founded by General Oglethorpe, and to act as missionary to the Indians. The S.P.G. may claim the honour, and a very great honour it is, of having had Wesley on their staff for nearly two years. A preliminary difficulty confronting him before leaving for this field lay in the fact that Susannah Wesley was now a widow, and it was thought that she might feel unable to part with her greatly-loved son. "Had I twenty sons I should rejoice that they were

all so employed, though I should never see them more," was her noble reply. "Our end," says Wesley, "in leaving our native country was not to avoid want (God having given us plenty of temporal blessings) . . . but simply this, to save our souls ; to live wholly to the glory of God." Ere departing on the *Simmonds*, which he boarded at Gravesend on the 14th October, 1735, Wesley rendered tardy homage to the once despised A Kempis by publishing a corrected version of that author.

He was accompanied by his friends Delamotte and Ingham. Charles Wesley, recently ordained, went with the expedition as General Oglethorpe's secretary. On board were twenty-six Moravians, under the leadership of David Nitschmann. The Moravians began to learn English. John devoted himself to German. For these simple believers had greatly impressed him, particularly by the absolute peace and calm which characterised them when encountering such heavy storms at sea as made Wesley's heart to sink within him. He began to suspect that his own faith in Christ was intellectual rather than vital. Gottlieb Spangenberg asked him, "Do you know yourself that Christ has saved *you* ?" and when Wesley replied "I do," he confessed that he "feared he was but uttering vain words."

The Georgia expedition ended in complete failure so far as its ostensible purposes were concerned. Wesley never got into touch with the Indians, and the young High Church clergyman with his meticulous attention to the least of the rubrics succeeded in almost completely alienating the simple colonists. As one of them plainly told him, "The people say they are Protestants, but as for you they cannot tell what religion you are of ; they never heard of such a religion before, and they do not know what to make of it." * After a time an impossible situation was reached. Wesley resigned

* "What a true Christian piety and simplicity breathe in these lines. And yet this very man, when I was at Savannah, did I refuse to admit to the Lord's Table, because he was not baptised ; that is, not baptised by a Minister who had been episcopally ordained. Can anyone carry High Church zeal higher than this ? And how well have I been since beaten with mine own staff." The reference is to a letter from a former Georgia parishioner.

his position and returned to England, landing at Deal on the 1st February, 1738, Charles having preceded him. His sojourn abroad, however, was not barren of results. Wesley was nothing if not conscientious, and, finding that there were Jews within his ecclesiastical territory, he learnt Spanish in order to converse with them. There were a few Vaudois, and he learnt Italian so that he might read prayers to them. We have already noted his acquisition of German. In the result, whatever was best in the theological literature of three nations was now newly opened to him, and when he had to face the urgent task of preparing a hymn-book for the use of the Methodists, "his translations preserved all the force and fire of the original." These translations are now the common heritage of all branches of the church wherever the English language is spoken.

Moreover, Wesley had met the Moravians, and, considerably to anticipate his final and mellow judgment in the matter, mingling with these people had convinced him that though he might have "the faith of a servant he had not the faith of a son." At that early period he could not see matters in this clear light, and deemed that, lacking the faith of a son, he was totally destitute of any such faith as God could recognise, that he was wholly alienated from God, a child of wrath, a whited sepulchre. "If it be said that I have faith, I answer, so have the devils—a *sort* of faith." He was unable to grasp the implication derivable from the twin facts that the devils, with their "sort" of faith, sincerely desired to hate God, and that he, with his "sort" of faith, sincerely desired to love God. The natural inference that his faith differed from theirs as Heaven does from Hell only came to him after long years. His state of mind at this era must have been terrible. Of all men in England at that day Wesley most earnestly strove to serve his Maker, and of all men he felt himself to be furthest from the centre of his heart's longing.

On the day that Wesley arrived in England from Georgia Whitefield left England for Georgia. Notes were hurriedly exchanged between them, but there was no opportunity for meeting. To quote from Southey: "less clear, less logical,

less formed for command and legislation than Wesley, Whitefield was of a more ardent nature, and arrived at the end of his spiritual course before Wesley had obtained sight of the goal." During Wesley's absence Whitefield had had a wonderful spiritual experience. After a Lenten fast of terrible severity, and a consequent serious illness, he was led, during the ensuing convalescence, to a more excellent way. "With what joy unspeakable was my soul filled when the weight of sin went off, and an abiding sense of the pardoning love of God and a full assurance of faith broke in upon my disconsolate soul!" He was soon after ordained by the Bishop of Gloucester, at the Bishop's express desire. This kindly man gave him five guineas to start the world with. Whitefield preached at St. Mary de Cript. Complaint was made to Bishop Benson that fifteen persons had been driven mad by the sermon. His lordship blandly replied that he wished the madness might not be forgotten before next Sunday. There followed short periods in Oxford, London, Gloucester, and Bristol, where his ministrations produced the most extraordinary results in the way of crowded congregations and enormous collections for various charitable objects. At Bristol the churches were as full on week-days as they used to be on Sundays, and on Sundays crowds had to go away for want of room. On a second visit there, five times a week "some hung upon the rails of the organ-loft, others climbed upon the leads of the church, and all together made the church so hot with their breath, that the steam would fall from the pillars like drops of rain." In the midst of it all he decided to go and assist in the work in Georgia, not knowing of Wesley's intended return. Thus it turned out, almost literally, that he and Wesley were

"As ships that pass in the night,
"And speak each other in passing."

Whitefield had started a work, *the* work, the work of the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. Wesley was to carry this work to completion, over fifty-three years of strenuous toil in nearly every parish in Great Britain and

Ireland. But meanwhile he had not even been "evangelically revived" himself. We have seen the dismal state of mind in which he reached England, in February, 1738. He continued in this state until the 24th May, all the time remaining in close association with the Moravians, and hoping for better things. On the evening of that day he went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one of the assembly was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. The rest must be given in Wesley's own words. "About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart by faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed; I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation, and an assurance was given me that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

The 24th May is celebrated as Empire Day. There is a peculiar and unrecognised appropriateness in the fact. It is the anniversary of the occasion on which a candle was lit. Latimer's was a great candle, and must never be put out. It stands for a pure and primitive faith. Wesley's was equally great. It stands for a living and conquering faith. Let these lights be extinguished, and Britain is done. Let them burn with ever added intensity, and Britain will conquer the world for Christ. They now burn dimly. Our only hope is that the God who has been so merciful to His Israel in the past will revive us again. If we are to accomplish our allotted task a revival of vital belief is the first and crucial necessity. It will have to come within a very short period from the present time. Are you who are reading these pages holding this revival back through retaining in your own pocket gold which ought ere now to have found its way into the Sacred Treasury? We mention the matter because this type of laxity is the greatest curse in the Church at the present moment. When all the praying people are giving people, then God will begin to give. The revival of the ancient practice of tithing is the urgent task to which we feel ourselves called, and if certain attacks, some of them most discourteous and unchristian attacks, upon British-Israel Truth have led us to place the result of our own studies

in the fields of prophecy and history before the public, our great aim in this as in every work we have produced has been to lead the individual Israelite back to observance of the tithing law, that great and God-ordained means of blessing in things both spiritual and temporal. Wesley himself would never have been so owned of God in the saving of souls had it not been for his constant employment of his purse in the saving of bodies.

Latimer's candle has never been wholly dimmed, or Wesley's, and they never will be—wholly. But it is for us to see that the lights burn with an ever-greater flame. This we are not doing.

What difference did Wesley's experience on the 24th May, 1738, really make ?

We have to put it in our own words, which may prove to be not exactly Wesley's words, though, we trust, closely parallel thereto. The essential difference seems to be this. Hitherto Wesley had been an orthodox Churchman, believing in the deity, and in the resurrection of Christ, and, in a general and impersonal way, in the atonement wrought by our Lord, Who had seventeen hundred years before ascended into Heaven and was very far off. Now he was an orthodox Churchman, believing in the deity and in the resurrection of Christ, and, in a close and personal way, in the atonement wrought by our Lord, Who had seventeen hundred years before ascended into Heaven, and, through the Holy Spirit, was still "nearer than breathing."

Now this risen Lord had said "all power is given unto Me." If that were so, let the fact be tested. England was in thick darkness ; let there be light. Let Christ's followers yield themselves to Him in simple faith to be used as the instruments of the Holy Spirit by whom the power is manifested. Wesley, who though he had now become a son, with the deep wisdom of the truly spiritual man retained to the end of his days the habit of the servant, wholly yielded himself to his Master in simple faith to be thus used. When a member of the Holy Club, and relying on church attendance, prayer, Bible, and sacrament, the result of his work was evanescent. When a member of the church

militant, relying on the power of the Spirit, and using to the full all such means of grace as church attendance, prayer, Bible, and sacrament, the results were, in a hundred thousand cases, permanent.

Let it be noted that had Wesley gone off into enthusiasm, and, because a vital religion is wholly spiritual, abandoned his habits of prayer and Bible study, and neglected the sacrament, the Holy Spirit would have left him. There is a Power, but there are ordinances. Amongst the glorious paradoxes which go to form true Christianity there is this, that our faith is wholly spiritual and largely ritual. * Let the ritual part go, and the vital part will soon follow. To retain the best Wesley knew that he must still cling to the good. "The reproach of Christ I am willing to bear ; but not the reproach of enthusiasm if I can help it."

He is now known to religious history as the man who lit the flame of a vital faith in a thousand towns and villages throughout Great Britain and Ireland. It is admitted that this was the result of the gift of the Spirit. To attain the end, however, certain other gifts had been allotted to one who was manifestly a chosen vessel, a man who had been prepared at every point for his tremendous task. He had great scholarship, but not greater than other of his contemporaries. He was acutely logical, but this brought about polemic victories, rather than conversions. He was a gentleman through and through, but he always preached to the common people. But certain endowments he had, which were not of the common order. One of these is found in the curious physical or physiological fact that he could get through enormous masses of work, literary, philanthropic, and evangelistic, on an allowance of four hours sleep out of the twenty-four, and this for years together. He was thus naturally qualified to do two men's work in every working day. To quote from his own account of the matter : "*The Notes on the New Testament* is a work which I should scarce

* We trust that no one will twist our words into a plea for what is absurdly termed "ritualism." The "ritualists" of the Church of England are, of course, "ceremonialists," and should be thus spoken of. Every branch of the Church has its "rites."

ever have attempted, had I not been so ill as not to be able to travel or preach, and yet so well as to be able to read and write. I wrote from five in the morning to nine at night ; except the time of riding, half an hour for each meal, and the hour between five and six in the evening." The illness to which he alludes was a second attack of consumption, which occurred in middle life. When a man of eighty-three he writes : " I now applied myself in earnest to the writing of Mr. Fletcher's Life, having procured the best materials I could. To this, I dedicated all the time I could spare, till November, from five in the morning till eight at night. These are my studying hours ; I cannot write longer in a day without hurting my eyes."

Owing to his forceful intellect and his power of delving immediately into the very centre of the various problems brought before him, his was singularly rapid and effective work, whether he were writing a sermon on the Trinity or studying the effects of electricity on the patients in his dispensary.

A further endowment, and one of the first order of importance, is found in the peculiar character of his vocal organs. Whitefield "preached like a lion." Wesley preached like a clergyman, and, if Horace Walpole is to be believed, could at times be sufficiently disappointing from the standpoint of oratory. But his voice carried clearly and easily to the furthest confines of the largest congregation. When he held forth, as he often did, in the open-air, at Gwennap, to 30,000 persons, each auditor heard him as though the words were addressed to him personally. This fact is amazing.

There remains a further fact, still more amazing, which must we think have had its roots in a faculty spiritual rather than purely natural. As the sermon proceeded, each single member of his congregation came to believe that Wesley *was addressing him personally*. The other 29,999 individuals were forgotten, and there remained only the man and his mentor ! We often hear of appealing to the crowd. Wesley's appeal was to each member of the crowd, as though he had been speaking to him alone, with none other present

in all the country-side but the God Who made it. This is the secret of his peculiar power. And it is so remarkable that it may prove a fruitful field for meditation. Men are not converted in masses, but one by one. Wesley could synchronously deal with the mass as units. It is a marvel for the admiration of all ages.

Now, let us see what the inevitable result must be. Imagine yourself in a small field from which there is no immediate egress, alone, save for the presence of one man, a scholar, a logician, a saint, a man energised by the power of the Holy Spirit. He talks to you about your soul, and this with the authority of the saint, of the man speaking in the power of God. He tells you that in the sight of God you are a sinner, that your own conscience already condemns you, and that you know that you are unfitted to appear before the Judgment Throne, at which your condemnation is certain. There is time granted you for repentance, and that time is now. The outcome will, under such circumstances, be certain. A few doubts may have to be dealt with by the scholar, a few quibbles silenced by the logician, but conviction of sin will be brought about by the inspired saint. This conviction of sin will produce one of two results. Either you will repent and turn to God, or you will throw a brick-bat at the man's head and try to run away. This was Wesley's immediate experience, roaring crowds who thirsted for his blood, mingled with weeping crowds who thirsted for the water of life. From the former Wesley was preserved in a series of providential deliverances lasting over some years. "It is my rule, confirmed by long experience, always to look a mob in the face." The latter he encountered, and that constantly, during the whole of the half-century which dated from the year 1738.

It is not our intention to follow his career in any detail from this time. Suffice it to say that Wesley was a statesman who determined that the results of his work should not be lost during his own necessary absence from the constantly changing fields of labour. His converts were formed into little societies, which, in time, were divided

into "classes" under the leadership of some individual worthy of the responsibility. The classes met weekly for prayer, Bible study, and plain discourse as to the work of God in their own hearts, so that they might mutually assist one another. Poor stewards were appointed for the distribution of the society's charities. Chapel stewards were required as preaching houses were erected. Circuit stewards were appointed as the country came to be divided into "districts," which were themselves split up into "circuits." * and arrangements had to be made for the maintenance of those itinerant preachers, really the first generation of Methodist Ministers, who attached themselves to Wesley's cause, and locally filled in his work in further detail. These itinerants, as their name implies, constantly changed their spheres of work, and this tended to a continual and enlivening freshness of view. They all met Wesley in Conference once a year. Thus, a large, a growingly intelligent, an increasingly affluent, and a markedly spiritual brotherhood was growing up within the Church of England. Which Church, never having had the sympathy, the understanding, and the statesmanship necessary for the right using of the enthusiast, calmly let the whole advantage go, turned the cold shoulder on the Wesleyans, parted with a body of people who would have done infinitely more for her than the whole of the Jesuit Order has ever done for Rome, and now, riddled with Anglo-Papistry, wonders whatever can have occurred so to disturb the balance of parties within her borders!

* The "district" is the Wesleyan diocese, and the "circuit" their parish. A circuit may contain several churches, each with its minister, and a number of chapels of ease, chiefly served by local preachers. The senior clergyman in each circuit, roughly corresponding to the vicar, is styled the "superintendent" and the "chairman of the district" is virtually the bishop. We hope we may be pardoned for giving these trivial details, but we have found the ignorance of many Churchmen as regards Wesley and the Wesleyans to be so abysmal that they may not be irrelevant. Wesleyan Methodism is not a "free church," as it is controlled by the Court of Chancery, just as the Church of England is subject in certain respects to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The relation between the Wesleyans and the dissenters has never been cordial, owing to the decidedly friendly leaning of the former to the Establishment. Would that it had been fully reciprocated!

The separation, of course, did not occur in Wesley's lifetime.

We have referred to the Methodists as "growingly intelligent." It is often forgotten that Wesley gave much time and labour to the preparation of cheap educational works for his people, and that he may be justly regarded as the pioneer of popular education and of popular literature in this country. He was a dozen men rolled into one. His mottoes for the Methodists were, "All at it, and always at it," and "Do all the good you can, to all the people you can, at all the times you can, in all the ways you can," which two words of wisdom he continually enforced both by precept and example.

CHAPTER IX.

THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT: THE METHODISTS.

“He hath not dealt so with any nation.”—*Psalms* cxlvii, 20.

THE reader of the *Life* will naturally wish to turn to the *Journal*, the man's own record of his own life. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, almost accidentally perusing an abridged copy, lying on his desk ere dispatch to the reviewer, found the work to be the most enlightening guide to the manners and circumstances of the eighteenth century with which he had met, and it has been a matter of interest to notice how frequently the Roman Catholic “father of the House of Commons” has adorned the pages of his own weekly journal with something in pithy English culled from the pages of Wesley's *Journal*.

The four volumes must be left to the perusal of the reader. But from these tomes we shall endeavour to produce a few quotations calculated to illustrate the man and the age. It is impossible in the selection of such extracts to please every taste, but what is of no interest to one may give a moment's gratification to another.

The style is like the man, crisp, terse, entirely lacking in redundancy, the hasty but considered jottings of one who never wasted a moment. The subjects dealt with are of the most diverse type, but, irrelevant in its accidents, the book is directed to one main object, the building up of his followers in their most holy faith. It was from time to time issued to the public in the lifetime of the author, a fact which often adds to its sting. It is not a pietistic work, but one of general interest, particularly to those engaged upon the study of the history of the central and later parts of the eighteenth century.

All is grist that comes to Wesley's mill ; the state of the roads, always a matter of interest to a man who travelled 4,500 miles a year on horseback ; the American rebellion ; the domestic habits of cats ; a marvellous friendship between a dog and a raven, which would have done credit to the columns of the *Spectator* ; criticisms of art ; the spectacle of the King in the robing-room of the House of Lords ; the spectacle of Count Zinzendorf losing his temper over "Christian perfection" ; the influence of music on the wild animals at the Tower, where the nucleus of the Zoo found its habitat ; a few notes on the singing of nightingales ; records of visits paid to the historic figures of the time, notably Johnson and Wilberforce—all find their place in this history of marvellous, unceasing, unresting activity. He visits Lord George Gordon during the latter's incarceration in the Tower consequent upon the Protestant riots always associated with his name, and familiar to readers of *Barnaby Rudge*. This was at his lordship's request, and Wesley left the distinguished delinquent cherishing bright hopes, not subsequently realised, of his spiritual state. He meets Wilberforce, and records his satisfaction that so good a man should be the intimate friend of Mr. Pitt. His frequent intercourse with Howard, the prison reformer, greatly delights him, and he feels assured that nothing but the power of God could give him the bodily strength necessary to the carrying out of his labours in the cause of incarcerated humanity.

Of direct reference to the great lexicographer there occur three instances. * "I spent two hours with that great man, Dr. Johnson, who is sinking into the grave by a gentle decay." And elsewhere, "I read over Dr. Johnson's *Tour to the Western Isles*. It is a very curious book, wrote with admirable sense and, I think, great fidelity ; although, in some respects, he is thought to bear hard on the nation, which I am satisfied he never intended." (May we parenthetically remark that in his day it was correct to use "wrote" for "written," and "you was" for "you

* In Johnson's house in Gough Square there is exhibited a picture showing Wesley in the pulpit and Johnson in the congregation.

were." We know some persons who have tripped over such small obstacles and thought that Wesley, who amongst his innumerable works penned one on English Grammar, ought to have taken a few lessons in the subject before rushing into print.) Later in life he again perused the *Tour*, and notes : " I had time to read over and consider Dr. Johnson's *Tour*. I had heard that he was severe upon the whole nation, but I could find nothing of it. He simply mentions (but without any bitterness) what he approved or disapproved ; but many of the reflections are extremely judicious ; some of them very affecting."

One literary criticism leads to another, and we may reproduce his opinions of two or three of the works of his contemporaries, starting with Voltaire, of whom we have two notices, the first reading : " By Voltaire's *Henriade* I was more than ever convinced that the French is the poorest, meanest language in Europe ; that it is no more comparable to the German or Spanish than a bagpipe is to an organ ; and that . . . it is as impossible to write a fine poem in French as to make fine music upon a Jew's harp."

The second : " On the road I read over Voltaire's memoirs of himself. Certainly never was a more consummate coxcomb ! But even his character is less horrid than that of his Royal hero. Surely so unnatural a brute never disgraced a throne before ! A monster, that made it a fixed rule to let no woman and no priest enter his palace. What a pity that his father had not beheaded him in his youth, and saved him from all this sin and shame."

Of Laurence Sterne he writes : " I casually took a volume of what is called *A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy*. Sentimental, what is that ? It is not English. He might as well say Continental. It is not sense. It conveys no determinate idea ; yet one fool makes many. And this nonsensical word (who would believe it ?) is become a fashionable one ! However, the book agrees full well with the title ; for one is as queer as the other. For oddity, uncouthness, and unlikeness to all the world beside, I suppose the writer is without a rival. In returning I read

a very different book, published by an honest Quaker, on that execrable sum of all villanies, commonly called the Slave Trade."

With his remarks on Cook, Swedenborg and Chesterfield, we must bring his literary criticisms to a conclusion. We have merely taken small examples out of a huge bulk. In Cook's *Voyages* he observed: "(1) Things absolutely incredible; Hume or Voltaire might believe this, but I cannot. (2) Things absolutely impossible." Concerning Swedenborg he writes: "I read a little more of that strange book, Swedenborg's *Theologia Coelestis*. It surely contains many excellent things. Yet I cannot but think that the fever he had twenty years ago, when he supposed he was 'introduced into the society of angels,' really introduced him into the society of lunatics."

But, like Johnson, he reserves his heaviest cudgel for Lord Chesterfield, and lays on the thwacks with an ever heightening joy. Johnson's famous letter to Chesterfield will be familiar to all, and his epigrammatic summary of Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son*, as a book written to inculcate the morals of a whore and the manners of a dancing master, will serve as an introduction to Wesley's continuation of the same theme. "Chesterfield was a man of much wit, middling sense, and some learning; but as absolutely void of virtue as any Jew, Turk, or Heathen that ever lived. I say not only void of all religion (for I doubt whether he believed there is a God, though he tags most of his letters with the name, for better sound sake), but even of virtue, of justice, and mercy, which he never once recommended to his son. And truth he sets at open defiance. He continually guards him against it. Half his letters inculcate deep dissimulation, as the most necessary of all accomplishments. Add to this his studiously instilling into the young man all the principles of debauchery, when himself was between seventy and eighty years old. Add his cruel censure of that amiable man the Archbishop of Cambray (what a vast disparity between the two!) as a mere time-serving hypocrite! And this is the favourite of the age! Whereas if justice and truth take place, if he is rewarded

according to his desert, his name will stink to all generations." All this is sufficiently trenchant.

Wesley had a sense of humour, and his own humour was of the driest type. He may, like Solomon, have said of laughter "it is madness," and truth compels us to state that the only record he has left of his having ever been reduced to helpless risibility occurs in the midst of a few notes on demoniacal agency, when Satan is given full credit for the achievement. But his wit was occasionally most caustic. Everyone knows the story of his having met a conceited and arrogant young nobleman in the centre of a narrow bridge. There was no room to pass, one must give ground. "I never make way for a fool," roared the coxcomb. "I always do, my lord," was the reply, accompanied by a bow and a meek withdrawal. The earlier volumes of the *Journal* are replete with stories of the angry raging crowds which had to be encountered. Wesley obviously much enjoyed the frequent complete discomfiture of those who would molest him. Thus, "In the evening, though it was cold, I was obliged to preach abroad at Newcastle. One buffoon laboured much to interrupt. But as he was bawling, with his mouth wide open, some arch boys gave him such a mouthful of dirt as quite satisfied him." And, later: "We went to Newark. But our friends were divided as to where I should preach. At length they found a convenient place, covered on three sides, and on the fourth open to the street. It contained two or three thousand people well, who appeared to hear as for life. Only one big man, exceeding drunk, was very noisy and turbulent, till his wife seized him by the collar, gave him two or three hearty boxes on the ear, and dragged him away like a calf. But at length he got out of her hands, crept in among the people, and stood quiet as a lamb." And as a third instance: "At Burnley, high and low, rich and poor, now flocked together from all quarters, and all were eager to hear, except one man, who was the town-crier. He began to bawl amain, till his wife ran to him and literally stopped his noise; she seized him with one hand, and clapped the other upon his mouth, so that

he could not get out one word. God then began a work, which, I am persuaded, will not soon come to an end."

From our authority we have culled some specimens of his caustic wit, which will, at least, serve to illustrate a side of his character which has been somewhat overlooked. "I met a gentleman in the street, cursing and swearing in so dreadful a manner that I could not but stop him. He soon grew calmer ; told me he must treat me with a glass of wine ; and that he would come and hear me, only he was afraid I should say something against fighting of cocks." "I desired John W—— to preach at five, and I no longer wondered at the deadness of his hearers." "There was, at first, much struggling at St. Ewe, but the two gentlemen who occasioned it are now removed, one to London, the other into eternity." "At Grimsby I preached to a mixed congregation, some of whom were exceeding serious, and some exceeding drunk." "I was surprised to find so little fruit at Portsmouth after so much preaching. That accursed itch of disputing had well nigh destroyed all the seed which had been sown. And this 'vain jangling' they called 'contending for the faith.' I doubt the whole faith of these poor wretches is but an opinion." "In the evening I preached to a sleepy congregation at Reading on 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' " "The Congregation was large and wild enough ; yet in a short time they were deeply attentive. Only three or four gentlemen put me in mind of the honest man at London, who was so gay and unconcerned while Dr. Sherlock was preaching concerning the day of judgment. One asked, 'Do you not hear what the Doctor says ?' He answered, 'Yes, but I am not of this parish !' " "The two women who were the most useful of all others to the Epworth Society forsook them, the one leaving town, and the other leaving God." "I set out for Norwich, in the coach oddly called the Expedition." "I appoint John Horton, George Wolff, and William Marriott, to be Executors of this my last Will and Testament ; for which trouble they will receive no recompense till the resurrection of the just."

The deadliest thrust, however, is reserved for Michael

Fenwick, a follower who complained to Wesley that he never received any notice in the *Journal*. Wesley apologised and promised that the defect would be made good. It was, in the following terms: "I preached at Clayworth. I think none was unmoved but Michael Fenwick; who fell fast asleep under an adjoining hay-rick."

The tact which he displayed in dealing with awkward and angular people is also noticeable. There were at that time a number of persons who styled themselves "French Prophets" and went about talking twaddle under pretence of inspiration, and gaining great credit thereby with many unthinking persons. One day two of these gentry called upon Wesley, explained that they had received spiritual intimation that he was that day to be "borned again," and asked if they might stay to witness the process. Giving them a courteous welcome, he took them down to the Society's room, where it was tolerably cold. They had neither food nor drink with them, and their host felt himself under no necessity to provide them with these palliatives. They stayed till evening, and then went quietly away. Wesley adds, "I have not seen them since." On another occasion he was engaged in administering the Communion to a congregation of mingled churchmen and dissenters, and including a considerable proportion of the latter. He was determined that they should kneel at the rails, but was fully aware that diplomacy must effect this result. He, therefore, before administering the bread and wine, requested every communicant, when receiving the elements, to assume that posture which he deemed most convenient. With one single exception, they all knelt. "Had I required them to kneel, probably one-half of them would have sat."

In another work * we have endeavoured to say something in reference to Wesley as a student of occult phenomena, and have, therefore, nothing to say on that subject here. But we may indulge in two quotations which show him to have been a believer in attendant spirits, good and evil, which, after all, is a doctrine sufficiently Scriptural. By way of preface to the first, we may remark that it would

* *The Problem of Spiritism*, Ch. II.

call for no small moral courage to preach at Bristol in 1788 against the continuance of the Slave Trade. "The House from end to end was filled with high and low, rich and poor. . . . About the middle of the discourse, while there was on every side attention still as night, a vehement noise arose, none could tell why, and shot like lightning through the whole congregation. The terror and confusion were inexpressible. You might have imagined it was a city taken by storm. The people rushed upon each other with the utmost violence ; the benches were broke in pieces ; and nine-tenths of the congregation appeared to be struck with the same panic. In about six minutes the storm ceased, almost as suddenly as it rose ; and, all being calm, I went on without the least interruption.

"It was the strangest incident of the kind I ever remember ; and I believe none can account for it, without supposing some preternatural influence. Satan fought, lest his kingdom should be delivered up." Wesley followed the matter up by a day of fasting and prayer, that God might do the apparently impossible, and loose the bands of all slaves everywhere throughout our dominions. This prayer has long ago been answered, though, as we have previously seen, there were relics of serfdom in Wesley's time in Great Britain itself.

The second quotation reads as follows : "*20th June, 1774.* About nine I set out for Horseley with Mr. Hopps and Mr. Smith. I took Mrs. Smith and the two little girls in the chaise with me. About two miles from the town, just on the brow of the hill, on a sudden both the horses set out, without any visible cause, and flew down the hill like an arrow out of a bow. In a minute the driver fell off the coach-box. The horses, then went on full speed, sometimes to the edge of the ditch on the right, sometimes on the left. A cart came up against them ; they avoided it as exactly as if the man had been on the box. A narrow bridge was at the foot of the hill. They went directly over the middle of it. They ran up the next hill with the same speed ; many persons meeting us but getting out of the way. Near the top of the hill was a gate which led into a farmer's yard.

It stood open. They turned short and ran through it without touching the gate on the one side or the post on the other. I thought, 'However, the gate which is on the other side of the yard, and is shut, will stop them.' But they rushed through it as if it had been a cobweb, and galloped on through a cornfield. The little girls cried out 'Grandpa, save us !' I told them 'Nothing will hurt you. Do not be afraid,' feeling no more fear or care (blessed be God) than if I had been sitting in my study. The horses ran on till they came to the edge of a steep precipice. Just then Mr. Smith, who could not overtake us before, galloped in between. They stopped in a moment. Had they gone on ever so little, he and we must have gone down together !

"I am persuaded that both evil and good Angels had a large share in this transaction. How large we do not know now, but we shall know hereafter."

This was not the only occasion on which he and his experienced most providential deliverance from imminent disaster. The dislike of the early Methodists to snuff and tobacco has, for a reason which will shortly appear, seemed to us to be singularly ungenerous, and one elderly Methodist preacher of former days, on being rebuked for his after-dinner pipe, silenced the objectors by asking them if they were aware of the fact that Wesley owed his life to tobacco ? They had to confess their ignorance, and the old gentleman, reaching down his well-thumbed *Journal*, read out to them the following passage between the puffs : "27th October, 1739. I went in the afternoon to a society at Deptford, and thence, at six, came to Turner's Hall ; which holds (by computation) two thousand persons. The press both within and without was very great. In the beginning of the expounding, there being a large vault beneath, the main beam which supported the floor broke. The floor immediately sunk, which occasioned much noise and confusion among the people. But, two or three days before, a man had filled the vault with hogsheads of tobacco. So that the floor, after sinking a foot or two, rested upon them, and I went on without interruption."

So much for the Indian weed. The twin luxury, alcohol,

seems to have been a matter upon which Wesley had his own views, and very sensible views they were. He regarded spirits as a drug, useful on some occasions, but, perhaps, too frequently prescribed by the Faculty. Any Methodist, therefore, who distilled solely for sick persons might retain his still. All others were to give up their livelihood and find another. Concerning wines, Wesley is surprised that so able a medical writer as Dr. Cadogan should have wholly forbidden their use under all circumstances, as he personally regarded wine as "one of the noblest cordials in nature." He thinks the Doctor something of a crank on this particular subject. As for the rest, the last letter Wesley's secretary wrote for him is a direction as to how the old saint (now eighty-eight) liked his beer brewed.*

As has been stated, Wesley's mind broadened and deepened as increased years added their store to his already well-filled treasury of experience. At first, even after the never-to-be-forgotten event at Aldersgate Street, and full of zeal for his Master as he was, he was so much opposed to field-preaching that he thought it almost a sin for men to be saved outside a church and outside canonical hours. He was convinced of his error by the results accruing from Whitefield's triumphs in open-air work, and with Wesley to know the right was to do the right. There are few towns in England in which he did not preach in the open air, and that again and again, during his fifty years of evangelistic labour. "What marvel the devil does not love field-preaching? Neither do I: I love a commodious room, a soft cushion, an handsome pulpit. But where is my zeal if I do not trample all these under foot, in order to save one more soul?" Unlike Whitefield, he had, as we have already seen, the prescience immediately to form his converts into societies for mutual and constant help, with the consequence

* "The boys on Guy Fawkes Day always found Wesley a kind friend. His nephew said that he used to give his present with one condition: 'Here, my boys, is something for you on condition you do not drink more than will do you good.'" Telford's *Life of Wesley*, p. 358: We are glad to note that Mr. Telford speaks of Southey's *Life* as "beautiful and appreciative," an encomium which is certainly applicable to Mr. Telford's.

that the results were never allowed to evaporate into thin air. There remained a nucleus of faithful souls, "all at it and always at it." Very rarely do we meet with such a confession of failure as strikes us in the record stating that Methodism was at so low an ebb in the town in which he was then labouring—Norwich. "I met the society at seven, and told them in plain terms that they were the most ignorant, self-conceited, self-willed, fickle, untractable, disorderly, disjointed society that I knew in the Three Kingdoms. . . . I do not find that one was offended." Bravo, Norwich !

Very briefly to trace his doctrinal course, the Aldersgate Street experience had been so rich, so full, and so different from all the years of bondage to the Law, that he started off rather too rapidly in what we may term the experimental direction. Five days after that event he astonished his hostess by asserting that he had never been a Christian till five days before. She made the natural reply that he must have been a first-class hypocrite up to that time, for he had certainly so lived as to give everyone who knew him the impression that he was a most sincere Christian. Wesley could not then appreciate the force of Mrs. Hutton's caustic yet complimentary remark, and he went about preaching that, unless people had the same bright assurance of their soul's welfare that had been vouchsafed to him, they were not saved. In later life he acknowledged that, when he had taught ignorant rustics that, unless they knew they were saved they were, *ipso facto*, lost, it was a wonder that the peasants had not stoned him.

The following quotation will, perhaps, serve fully to set forth his later and more mature thoughts upon the subject : "I believe a few, but very few Christians have an assurance from God of everlasting salvation : and that is the thing which the apostle terms the plerophory, or full assurance, of hope. I believe more have such an assurance of being *now* in the favour of God, as excludes all doubt and fear : and this, if I do not mistake, is what the apostle means by the plerophory, or full assurance of faith. I believe a consciousness of being in the favour of God (which I do not term

plerophory, or full assurance, since it is frequently weakened, nay, perhaps interrupted by returns of doubt or fear) is the common privilege of Christians, fearing God, and working righteousness. Yet I do not affirm there are no exceptions to this general rule. Possibly some may be in the favour of God, and yet go mourning all the day long (but I believe this is usually owing either to disorder of body or ignorance of the Gospel promises). Therefore, I have not for many years thought a consciousness of acceptance to be essential to justifying faith."

Now this is good, but we feel that Wesley has not struck rock-bottom yet. For though Wesley and Luther were mighty teachers of the doctrine of justification by faith, and though they were absolutely right in this teaching, right from the standpoints of human experience and of Biblical exegesis, one feels, and knows, that this is not God's last word of mercy. All that we need to write on this question is contained in the following page of the *Journal*, doctrinally perhaps the most important page in the *Journal*, and dated 1st December, 1767 :—" Being alone in the coach, I was considering several points of importance. And thus much appeared clear as the day :—

" That a man may be saved, who cannot express himself properly concerning Imputed Righteousness. Therefore to do this is not necessary to salvation.

" That a man may be saved, who has not clear conceptions of it. (Yea, that never heard the phrase.) Therefore clear conceptions of it are not necessary to salvation ; yea, it is not necessary to salvation to use the phrase at all.

" That a pious churchman who has not clear conceptions even of Justification by Faith may be saved. Therefore clear conceptions even of this are not necessary to salvation.

" That a mystic, who denies Justification by Faith (Mr. Law, for instance), may be saved. But if so what becomes of the grand doctrine by which the Church stands or falls ? If so, is it not high time for us to lay aside big words that have no determinate meaning and to return to the plain word ' He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him ! ' "

We are on rock-bottom now.

It was Wesley's fate to travel a complete circle. The years before his perusal of Taylor we pass over. He was a gay, clean living, vivacious young fellow, perhaps a trifle worldly, though not in any drastically harmful fashion. Then came the period, inaugurated by Taylor's influence, when he began to "fear God and work righteousness." He was at this time twenty-two. For thirteen years he laboured without intermission for his Master, but the results were painful and disappointing to the last degree, for reasons previously set forth. At thirty-five he had sudden, conscious and personal experience of the living Christ, and thought the previous thirteen years were vain, void, and barren. He had merely had such faith as the devils have. All real Christians must inevitably have had such an experience as he himself had had, when his "heart was strangely warmed." Otherwise they were not Christians at all, merely nominal adherents of the Church. Now his heart had been so thoroughly warmed that God had certainly used him for the revival of vital belief as no other man had ever been used. (The case of St. Paul is not quite parallel, the apostle being a missionary to the heathen, not to the nominal Christian.) But, as years went on, and Wesley's own spiritual fervour increased, his damnatory fervour positively diminished, a clear proof of how really Wesley had submitted himself to the guidance of the Spirit. The doctrines of evangelicalism were true, gloriously true. But they did not contain all truth. Pushed too far they were found to be contradicted by the plain word of Scripture. So Wesley boldly finished up where he had begun, but at a point in space miles above where he had begun. For what we described as a circle was in reality a spiral.

He came to see that during the thirteen years of painful bondage to the law he had not had the faith of a devil, but the faith of a servant. In one moment of time God had deepened this minor faith of servanthood into the major faith of sonship. But the fate of a sincere servant of God is other than everlasting damnation, and therefore the mature Christian was not unkindly to belittle the immature

Christian on the ground of lack of personal experience of a higher emotion however much that higher emotion may have been the outcome of a deeper fact. If the weaker brother were a man who feared God and worked righteousness, God had said that he would accept him. Who was Wesley to reject him? Whilst travelling to his final goal, when about fifty years of age, he had, to placate his own theories, twisted the text quoted into meaning that "God would accept him in a measure." What "accepting a man in a measure" meant to Wesley's logical mind when he wrote it we do not know. He soon perceived that it meant nothing at all and, ten years later, honestly and courageously made his final statement on the subject. Wesley's evangelical theories were now enlarged so as to square with Bible facts. He has been twitted with "altering his opinions." He did not alter his opinions. He had perhaps too much contempt for mere opinions, his own or anybody else's, to trouble to alter them. But, so far from being a man of weak and changeable judgment, he was so tremendous a soul that he was prepared to remould his very convictions, when further study of God's Word and of his fellow men showed those convictions to be erroneous. A great man, this.

It was his further fate to "plough a lonely furrow," by which we mean that the guides and helpers of his youth, Law, the Moravians, and Whitefield, had all to be discarded lest his work be hindered. These painful divisions are not attributable to any personal ambition on the part of Wesley but simply to a zeal for purity of doctrine and permanence of result. As to his dispute with William Law, Wesley's official biographer, Tyerman, makes out Law to be in the right, and Law's official biographer, Canon Overton, makes out Wesley to be in the right. After which the plain man will jump to the immediate and sound conclusion that they were both in the right. Briefly, they were men of different temperaments and wholly different experiences, looking at the same things from a different angle.

With reference to the Moravians, these well-meaning foreigners had accomplished their great work for England when they had been the means of calling Wesley to vital

faith. Had there been actual ecclesiastical union between the Methodists and the Moravians, as at one time seemed likely, the result would we think have been merely to hamper the Methodists. Viewed in the light of after events, this would have been a disaster of the first magnitude. Despite the splendid spiritual tone and earnestness of some of their leaders, and the self-denying lives of most of their followers, all was not right with them. In their simple and fervid love they got, some of them, into the aggravating habit of writing silly hymns, which, intended as expressions of religious devotion, bore the outward resemblance of a doggerel diluted by dirtiness.* This was disturbing. There were also doctrinal differences between Wesley and Count Zinzendorf. They separated. Southey closes this matter in the words: "Whitefield also entered the lists against them. They had committed some fooleries, and, like the religious communities of the Roman Church, it appears, that if a believer were disposed to give or bequeath money to the brotherhood, they were not scrupulous concerning the injury which he might do to himself or his family. The heavier charges have been effectually disproved by time."

We take it that in our own day no branch of the Church is more highly or more justly respected than these same Moravian Brethren. We suspect that in Wesley's day there may have been a certain admixture of undesirables and a certain impregnation of quietist and unwholesome doctrine from which they succeeded ultimately in freeing themselves. It would not have been to the good of England at that time for the close connection between Wesley's and Zinzendorf's followers to have continued. Methodism might have been infected. In Wesley's opinion individual Methodists had been thus infected. It was the business of the sick man to retire and recover himself of his disease rather than to mingle with healthy persons to their undoing. "They had committed some fooleries." The recovery was complete, and

* Whilst engaged in the task of translating some Moravian gibberish, Southey made the discovery that our words "sorrow" and "gaol" are derived from Hebrew roots. Not a great matter, but interesting. We trust not lugubrious.

the Moravians are in proportion to their numbers the greatest missionary church of our times.

With Whitefield the trouble was doctrinal, and fundamental. Whitefield preached election, reprobation, and final perseverance. Wesley preached free grace and no slacking. They were bound to part, and they did part. In later years they met, occasionally for religious purposes, occasionally for social purposes. In 1769 Wesley says "I spent a comfortable and profitable hour with Mr. Whitefield, in calling to mind the former times, and the manner wherein God prepared us for a work which it had not then entered into our hearts to conceive." But doctrinally they remained for ever poles asunder.

Wesley believed that however righteous a man's life had been and, with a very slight exception noted above, whatever spiritual experiences he had attained to, it was still possible for him to fall from grace, as a Calvinist would admit, and to fall finally and totally from grace, as a Calvinist would not admit. It was therefore essential for even the most apparently established Christian to walk circumspectly. A man might be in a state of salvation now, but ere his life had run its full course, he might have become cold in faith and practice and might have turned out of the way. The Calvinists quoted texts. John pointed to actual events, and quoted other texts. The Calvinists asserted that those who fell had never been really converted. The Arminians retorted that this was a dirty shuffle. At times things got very warm indeed, and the parties exchanged their personal opinions of one another with great verbal frankness. * A wise man will hope that in the matter of final perseverance the Calvinists are right, but will so live as though the Arminians are right.

Wesley was a very forgiving and a very cheerful man and, through a long life which had its full meed of trouble, was

* "July 1777. I read the truly wonderful performance of Mr. Rowland Hill. I stood amazed! Compared to him, Mr. Toplady himself is a very civil, fair-spoken gentleman! I wrote an answer to it 'Not rendering railing for railing' (I have not so learned Christ) but 'speaking the truth in love.'" Yes, John, but did the truthful element never preponderate?

able to say : " I feel, but I never fret." Though his father had been cruelly persecuted by the dissenters, who had ousted him out of his military chaplaincy, and though his followers were here and there persecuted by dissenting ministers who refused to admit them to communion till they had "left the Methodists," he never let any feeling of animosity weigh with him in his dealings with dissent. We may quote his own words in relation to the rules of his societies :—" The Methodists alone do not insist on your holding this or that opinion, but they think and let think. Neither do they impose any particular mode of worship ; but you may continue to worship in your former manner, be it what it may. Now, I do not know of any other religious society, either ancient or modern, wherein such liberty of conscience is allowed, or has been allowed since the age of the Apostles. Here is our glorying, and a glorying peculiar to us."

We feel it to be a hopeless task to try to indicate the immensity of the change wrought through Wesley and what the mission of Wesley really meant for the England of the eighteenth century, that century which we now know had been Divinely appointed for the fuller restoration of Israel. We can only take three further excerpts from the *Journal*, and ask the reader leisurely to peruse them, to take time to meditate upon them, to endeavour to visualise a nation spiritually dead in 1702, and spiritually alive in 1800.

In June, 1755, we find the following passage :—" From a deep sense of the amazing work which God has of late years wrought in England, I preached on those words, ' He hath not so dealt with any nation.' This must appear to all who impartially consider (1) The number of persons on whom God has wrought ; (2) The swiftness of His work in many, both convinced and truly converted in a few days ; (3) The depth of it in most of these, changing the heart, as well as the whole conversation ; (4) The clearness of it, enabling them boldly to say ' Thou hast loved me, Thou hast given Thyself for me ' ; (5) The continuance of it . . . In England He has wrought for near eighteen years together, without any observable intermission. . . . There were only two or

three inconsiderable clergymen engaged in the work, with a few young, raw, unlettered men, and these opposed by well-nigh all the clergy, as well as the laity, in the nation. He that remarks this must needs own, both that this is a work of God, and that He hath not so wrought in any other nation."

Eleven years later he writes: "We concluded the year with solemn praise to God for continuing His great work in our land. It has never been intermitted for one year or one month, since the year 1738."

And nineteen years after the last-quoted entry he writes (March 21, 1785):—"I was now considering how strangely the grain of mustard-seed, planted about fifty years ago, has grown up. It has spread through all Great Britain and Ireland; the Isle of Wight and the Isle of Man; then to America, from the Leeward Islands, through the whole continent, into Canada and Newfoundland. And the Societies in all those parts, walk by one rule . . . striving to worship God, not in form only, but likewise 'in spirit and in truth!'"

From a general survey of Wesley's life, we have formed the opinion that for thirteen years from 1738 opposition to the Methodists was vindictive and continuous. By 1751 this had been drastically checked as the result of action wisely taken in the High Court. For the next thirteen years, till 1764, the feeling of hatred towards these righteous and good-living people was still there, but evil men did not dare to manifest it in the same way, the magistrates having been rather sternly taught their duty. In 1767 Wesley came out with his splendid pronouncement, which we have quoted in full, severing his own particular type of evangelism from the false doctrine which is *still to be met with amongst evangelists not of his school*. Having honoured God in this way, the rest of his life was triumph. Towards the end he was burdened with more invitations to preach than he could possibly accept, in the pulpits of certain Anglican churches hitherto largely closed to him.

There is one factor in Wesley's make-up upon which we wish to lay particular stress. His parents on both sides came

of Nonconformist and Puritan stock. They both became sincere members of the Anglican Church, years before Wesley's birth. And it has always seemed to us that in him all that was best in Anglicanism and all that was best in Puritanism met and had their full fruition, to the immeasurable benefit of our nation in all its varied spheres of responsibility. For there was a profound and prophetic truth in Wesley's exclamation :

“ I LOOK UPON ALL THE WORLD AS MY PARISH.”

CHAPTER X.

THE END OF THE CHASTISEMENT : THE PROMISES FULFILLED.

“ Who can express the noble acts of the Lord ; or show forth all his praise ? ”—*Psalm cvi*, 2

WE have noted that Grattan Guinness and G. H. Lancaster date the Seven Times Chastisement of Israel from the very commencement of Daniel's image, from the enthronement of Nabonassar in 747 B.C. Llewellyn Thomas dates it from 741 B.C. without giving his reasons for the choice of this date. Of the three, Mr. Thomas is right, and we append our reasons for thinking him so.

After perusing what Lancaster has written, we concur in his finding that the earliest stroke of judgment could not have fallen before 747 B.C. But after reading the relevant passages in the Scriptures and dipping into Milman, we feel personally satisfied that he has ante-dated the actual event by six years, that he has followed Guinness in seizing upon a possibility when the Scriptures would have led him to a closer approximation to certainty. We admit, however, that the matter is not void of obscurity.

In II Kings xv, 27-31, the whole reign of Pekah King of Israel is briefly recorded, and the fact noted of the captivity of a portion of Israel, the “ first fruits,” as Mr. Thomas has conveniently styled it, by Tiglath-Pileser. In vv. 32-38 we find the history of Jotham, King of Judah. To complete the story of Jotham there is necessitated a further reference to Pekah, who is here introduced as a conqueror, not as a gentleman who has just had the pleasing experience of losing a principality.

In II Kings xvi, Jotham dies, and is succeeded by Ahaz, who (v. 7) seeks the aid of Tiglath-Pileser against Israel,

and obtains it. We suggest that II Kings xvi, 7, explains II Kings xv, 29. The historian might have chosen to insert the reign of Pekah of Israel after that of Ahaz of Judah. He did choose to insert it before it, and, in fact, before that of Jotham. It is all a matter of the arrangement of his manuscript. By adopting the arrangement he has, he is apt to mislead. But he had a perfect right to the choice, and we need not be misled. If Pekah is victorious in the time of Jotham, and sadly bedraggled in the time of Ahaz, then the captivity of II Kings xv, 29, relates to the days of Ahaz. It therefore did not occur before 741 B.C. It could not occur later than 738 B.C. It seems fair to concede to Lancaster that the stroke must have fallen at as early a date as possible after 747 B.C. That earliest date is 741 B.C., and we respectfully concur with Mr. Thomas in fixing upon this as the closest approximation to certainty to which it is possible to attain. This fixes the beginning of the "end of the chastisement" as 1702 A.D.*

So rich are our historical records as to the abundant blessings of every sort and type, which were showered upon our nation between 1702 and 1845, that our task in setting them forth is rendered an impossibility from the start. We are engaged in writing a short work on British-Israel Truth, not a History of England. And when it comes to the task of choosing our material for merely illustrative purposes we are so embarrassed by our riches that point after point has to be merely ignored, if we are ever to bring our work to an end within a reasonable compass.

Let us indulge in one illustration of this fact. It occurred to us that a list of our famous literary men who were born in this era would be of interest to our readers. It is easy to compile such a list from a work of Sir Edmund Gosse, which lies readily to hand. A hurried glance shows that even this list, admirable as it is, is not complete, because it does not contain the name of Samuel Warren, K.C., the, at one time, exceedingly widely read author of *Ten Thousand*

* In Isaiah vii, 8, it is stated that "Ephraim shall be broken in pieces, that it be not a people, within three score and five years." The final disaster having occurred in 676, what does *within* 65 years previous to that date mean, 740 or 741 B.C.?

A Year and of that *Diary of a Late Physician* which obtained a deserved encomium from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. John Wesley does not appear therein, nor Adam Smith nor Thomas Arnold. We are working, therefore, on a list which is, as regards the years 1702 to 1845, admittedly defective. It contains three hundred and twenty-six names of British authors born between 1316 and 1851. When we find that of these no less than one hundred and fifty-three were born between 1702 and 1845, that one-half of our English literature is attributable to men who came into the world at this very time, one feels, firstly, that the list is too long for reproduction, and, secondly, that the era was unspeakably glorious for the fame of our native tongue.

Such list, therefore, cannot be incorporated in our work. Had it been, it would have contained the names of R. D. Blackmore (1825), George Borrow (1803), James Boswell (1740), Edmund Burke (1729), Robert Burns (1759), Thomas Carlyle (1795), T. De Quincey (1785) Charles Dickens, (1812), Henry Fielding (1707), James Antony Froude (1818), Edward Gibbon (1737), Oliver Goldsmith (1728), Thomas Hood (1799), Samuel Johnson (1709), Charles Kingsley (1819), Lord Macaulay (1800), John Ruskin (1819), Sir Walter Scott (1771), R. B. Sheridan (1751), Robert Southey (1774), Lord Tennyson (1809), W. M. Thackeray (1811), Sharon Turner (1768), Gilbert White (1720), in addition to nearly one hundred and thirty names of persons of possibly lesser importance.

And as regards our naval and military prowess during this time, shall we merely content ourselves with a very brief *résumé*. There occurred the capture of Gibraltar, and the battles of Blenheim (1704), Ramillies (1706), Oudenarde (1708), Malplaquet (1709), Passaro (1718), Cape Finisterre, and Belleisle (1747), the destruction of French fleets at Havre and Quiberon Bay, with capture of Guadeloupe (1759), capture of Quebec (1759), and conquest of all Canada (1760). Clive captured Arcot, Conjiveram, and Trichinopoly (1750-1) won the battle of Plassey, and obtained the possession of Calcutta (1757), and largely increased the English territory in India in 1759. In 1760

and 1761 the English became supreme in the Carnatic, after prolonged and successful fighting. To quote from Longman, "In 1762 the English became supreme in North America and India, and became the greatest colonial power." In 1763-5 Bengal and Oude were captured.

Even after those unhappy events which marked the middle of the latter half century, caused by a breach in Israel, what was the net result as regards Ephraim? That there was a temporary check in expansion, and only temporary. The British navy was supreme. Gibraltar and our previous conquests in India were retained. The enemies' fleets were almost destroyed. America, France, and Spain went bankrupt. Our National Debt was increased by £105,000,000, a burden which caused only a comparative inconvenience, and gave a number of jolly and gouty old gentlemen a further excellent outlet for their accumulated savings.

In 1795 Ceylon became finally ours. By 1803 South India and the Ganges Valley were completely in British hands. Between this date and 1835 our rule in India still further increased. Over and over again did our statesmen and governors endeavour to stem the tide of their own victories, and over and over again were they compelled to extend the bounds of Empire against their own wishes. The armies of Rome had continually to set up an altar to the great god Terminus, but the God of Israel knew no terminus.

To revert to matters other than Indian, in 1795 the Cape of Good Hope was taken from the Dutch. (The Dutch being a branch of Israel, South African affairs always have been, and always will be a source of difficulty, calling for very diplomatic treatment. No wonder that South Africa has been "the grave of great reputations.") In 1797 we won the Battles of St. Vincent and Camperdown. (Having treated the brave men who were fighting her battles at sea with her customary harshness, Israel was justly humiliated this year by mutinies in the fleet at the Nore and Spithead. From this time there was great improvement in the condition of the seamen.) In 1801 Nelson won his great Battle

of the Nile, and, in 1805, Trafalgar. The Napoleonic terror was brought to an end by the Duke of Wellington's victory at Waterloo in 1815.

The above is as brief and as sketchy a history of the period as can well be. For every successful event inserted ten have been omitted. But what other Empire can show such a record of victory and retention of conquests? Since 1815 the same Empire has grown to such colossal proportions as no previous Empire in the history of the whole world has ever attained to, a fact the realisation of which we do not seem able to arrive at, and the implications of which we utterly fail to grasp.

All through this period of tremendous and unexampled success our ancestors seem to have been haunted by the fear of disaster and ultimate destruction. There were evil prophets abroad in the land, and they had their credulous hearers by the score. Says Wesley, "For seventy years I have observed that after any war . . . England abounds with prophets who confidently foretell many terrible things. They generally believe themselves, but are carried away by a vain imagination. And they are seldom undeceived, even by the failure of their predictions; but still believe they will be fulfilled some time or other." Over and over again did the victims of these dolorous prognosticators come to John with their miserable forebodings, always to receive the same short answer—that when a man fell to worrying it was a fine time for him to start praying.

One thing that does strike us as altogether remarkable is this, that at this era, when God had promised immense increase of people to Joseph, and when He was fulfilling the promise by raising a population which stood at just over 5,000,000 in 1700 to the 12,000,000 which it reached by 1821, was the very time when Israel was riddled through and through by pessimistic credulity as to vast losses in her man power! Wesley shall help us out in this matter: "In travelling [1776] through [twelve counties, from Berkshire to Cumberland] I diligently made two enquiries. The first was, concerning the increase or decrease of the people;

the second, concerning the increase or decrease of trade. As to the latter, it is, within these two years, amazingly increased ; in several branches in such a manner as has not been known in the memory of man. Such is the fruit of the entire civil and religious liberty which all England now enjoys ! * And as to the former, not only in every city and larger town, but in every village and hamlet, there is no decrease, but a very large and swift increase. One sign of this is the swarms of little children which we see in every place." Incidentally, this sounds as though there had been a great increase in the birth-rate. There is, however, no reason for supposing that this had taken place. The birth-rate continued constant at about 4.5 children per marriage throughout the century. What had happened was this, that owing to improvement in trade more people were getting married, and that the death-rate (we take the figures for London only) of children under five years of age, which in 1750 was nearly 75 per cent., steadily sank from that time till by 1830 it was only 31 per cent.†

Later, in 1776, when in Bristol, Wesley writes : " In visiting all the families without Lawford Gate, by far the poorest about the city, I did not find so much as one person who was out of work. Another circumstance I critically inquired into. What is the real number of the people ? Dr. Price says (doubtless to encourage our good friends the French and Spaniards), ' The people of England are between four and five millions ; supposing them to be four, or four and a half, on an average, in one house.' I found, in the families which I visited, about six in a house. But one who has lately made a more general enquiry informs me that there are, without Lawford Gate, seven in a house. The same information I received . . . concerning Redcliffe." He goes on to prove that the number of houses had been grossly miscomputed, and comes to the conclusion that the

* A fruit of the legislation passed in the reign of William of Orange, with the hearty concurrence of that Monarch.

† See *Health, Wealth and Population, 1760-1815* (Routledge). A most useful and informative work.

number of inhabitants which this country possessed in 1776 was over seven millions.

Here John simply excelled himself. According to Rickman's figures the number at this time would be 7,700,000, and according to Finlaison's 7,600,000 (nearly). Statistical science corroborates Wesley's horse sense. The optimist was right, and the wretched Price, comforter of our foes, was wholly wrong. But what must it have meant to England in those times of stress to have had the big-hearted, cheerful, commonsense Wesley, who believed both in God and in his country, bringing his cheer, his courage, and his good hard head into every parish in the land, helping the troubled, and confuting the pessimist! We are tempted to pursue the subject in some further quotations, which the reader will not find wearisome. They will serve for a vivid portrayal of some of the scenes of this, our century of strife and victory.

"21st *June*, 1779. Finding the people at Alnwick were greatly alarmed, with the news of the French and Spanish fleets, I opened and applied 'Say ye to the righteous, it shall be well with him.' I believe many laid hold of the promise, and were not a little comforted. 22nd. Finding the panic had spread to Newcastle, I strongly enforced these words, 'The Lord sitteth above the waterfloods; the Lord reigneth a King for ever.'"

That our forefathers had some reason for perturbation, in a well-rooted distrust of a government that could not be relied upon vigorously to attend to all necessary detail, is vouched for by the following amazing transcript: "1st *Sept.*, 1779. At Exeter a gentleman, just come from Plymouth, gave us a very remarkable account: 'For two days the combined fleets of France and Spain lay at the mouth of the harbour. They might have entered it with perfect ease. The wind was fair; there was no fleet to oppose them; and the island, which is the grand security of the place, being incapable of giving them any hindrance; for there was scarce any garrison, and the few men that were there had no wadding at all, and but two rounds of powder.' But had they not cannon? Yes, in abundance;

but only two of them were mounted ! Why, then, did they not go in, destroy the dock, and burn, or at least plunder, the town ? I believe they could hardly tell themselves. The plain reason was, the bridle of God was in their teeth ; and He had said ‘ Hitherto shall ye come, and no further.’ ” *

The population increased, as the Almighty had said should be the case. The birth-rate maintained its level, and the man-hood and woman-hood attained to larger proportions through a most remarkable decrease in the death rate. We have given figures which show that, in 1750, a London wife knew that of the four children she would bear her husband, she was destined to bury three before they attained their fifth birthday. But by 1830, matters had gradually, but so happily, altered that she might hold a bright hope of rearing three, and only losing one.† These extra children lived, and in their turn married, with similar result. But, apart from this fact, the length of life generally increased, and increased greatly, during the century.

The cause of this increase is remarkable in its mere simplicity. There was an improvement in agriculture, and particularly in market gardening. Wesley notes, in 1788 : “ When I was in Scotland first, even at a Nobleman’s table, we had only flesh meat of one kind, but no vegetables of any kind ; but now they are as plentiful here as in England. Near Dumfries there are five very large public gardens, which furnish the town with greens and fruit in abundance.” People ate healthier food and lived longer. We suspect

* We suspect that Wesley felt particular pleasure in recording such items as “ About this time the following note was given into my hand at Wapping : ‘ John White, master-at-arms aboard His Majesty’s ship *Tartar*, now at Plymouth, desires to return Almighty God thanks for himself and all the ship’s company, for their preservation in four different engagements they have had with four privateers, which they have taken ; particularly the last, wherein the enemy first boarded them. They cleared the deck, boarded in their turn, and took the ship, thirty of the enemy being killed and fifty more wounded. Only two of our crew were wounded, who, it is hoped, will recover.’ ”

† This is not quite accurate, but we cannot deal with decimals of a baby.

that one potent reason for the lowered death-rate amongst young children simply consisted in the fact that nursing-mothers were themselves more normally and more naturally fed as the century went on, and the infants, therefore, had a greater power of resistance in overcoming their small ailments. "In the second half of the eighteenth century the technique of English agriculture was revolutionised by the introduction from Holland of root crops and clover. The clover rotation abolished the necessity for fallow, and, in effect, added one-third to the arable land. Turnip husbandry abolished the autumn slaughtering of cattle and fresh animal products became available in the winter. . . . Selective breeding coupled with good feeding improved both sheep and cattle, while the binding properties of the turnip revolutionised the cultivation of light soils. Under turnip husbandry the great sandy wastes in Norfolk were transformed into some of the best wheat land in England, and the promoters of the reform are said to have, in effect, added a province to their country." Add to this the greater ease in the carrying of foodstuffs to the towns through the growth of the canal system, and one realises what an enormous benefit this resurgence of agriculture meant for the country as a whole. The first canal was cut in 1760.

Increase in wealth, increase in population, naval pre-eminence, military prowess, possession of the gates of her enemies, colonial expansion, all had been promised to Israel in the "latter days"—the days between the coming of Christ and the millennium. These promises could not accrue before the beginning of the Third Day, or, in other words, before 1198 A.D. They could hardly accrue in their fulness before 1702 A.D., the beginning of the last period of chastisement. Between 1198 and 1702, Israel having now actually entered upon a time of less Divine disfavour, many things might be expected to occur which would herald the dawn of a still greater day. Between 1702 and 1845 Israel, having entered upon the time of positive Divine favour *all* things must happen which were promised to the Fathers.

They *all* occurred in the experience of the British people *only* and at exactly the dates enumerated.

Under these circumstances it is for our opponents definitely to show that the British are not Israel by proving the total impossibility of a western migration for Israel. This they cannot do.

We must safeguard ourselves from the error of thinking that all the blessings of the Third Day were to occur only between the years 1198 and 1325. Or that all the blessings of the lapse of the chastisement were to find their fulfilment solely between 1702 and 1845.

The commencement of the Third Day, a Divine period lasting down to and beyond the period in which we are now living, was in 1198, but more accurately in the period 1198 to 1325. From the former date to 1702 the fortunes of the nation must, on the whole, be continuously on the increase, with 1198 to 1325 as a very definitely marked era.

From 1702 to 1845, that small section of the Third Day during which the Seven Times Chastisement absolutely died away, the fortunes of the nation must most portentously increase, and all the promised blessings be experienced, but only as a prelude to the still greater opportunities offered to Israel subsequently to 1845.

These opportunities of increased usefulness and consequent aggrandisement have been partly realised by the nation, but we have been sore let and hindered by our impenitent and stiff-necked selves. Since the Methodist Revival we have done for God just one-tenth of the things which a nation which had experienced the Methodist Revival ought to have done for God. And it seems as if nothing would arouse us nationally to a sense of the loving and obedient service due to the God of Love, Who has never failed in fulfilling one promise of mercy and of blessing to a nation which, we fear, has scarcely deserved the least of all His mercies.

Has He to chastise us again, or will we yet repent before the divine wrath once more falls upon Israel? The chastisement would not be to the destruction of Israel, but it might be to the destruction of all the wicked in Israel. And slackness is itself a wickedness. What if judgment began at the House of God?

The question of the Israelitish origin of the British people is one that will loom more and more largely as the years which are immediately ahead of us bring each their store of continuously fulfilled prophecy to the treasury of British-Israel argument. We make the confession that this was a matter upon which we were ourselves at one time somewhat lukewarm. So long as the English nation continued to be the greatest missionary and administrative Empire of the world, so long as we continued, to some extent, to do the work of Israel, it seemed to us a matter of comparative indifference as to whether our origin were openly recognised or not. As time went on, and we mused further over the matter, we perceived that this mode of thought was one most deeply and most wickedly dishonouring to Almighty God. It is the concentrated essence of don't-careism, parading under the guise of spiritual religion.

Under the care and providence of the Almighty, our ancestor, Abraham, was called out from amongst the heathen that he might be instructed in the knowledge of the true God. He and his heirs were to disperse the Satanic darkness which had, by now, concealed the primal revelation. His descendants were sent down into Egypt that, under the play of certain natural forces, they might quickly become a nation. They were delivered from their Egyptian taskmasters by the direct operation of Almighty God, Who used in their deliverance certain natural forces in a miraculous and unusual way. Moses the Lawgiver brought them through the wilderness wanderings to the Promised Land of plenty. Their constant grumbling and their continuous disobedience nearly broke the heart of their leader, and led him to an explosion of wrath which prevented his personal entrance upon the land of Canaan.

When they had arrived there, they callously and foolishly left their first task incompletely performed, and involved themselves in disaster after disaster. It was continually lechery and disobedience, drunkenness and disobedience, idolatry and flat disobedience. Whenever there were any signs of repentance, instantly the Divine favour returned to them.

Judges were granted, Kings enthroned, prophets inspired. It was all useless. The nation would have nothing of the merciful God, Whose only thought for them was one of blessing. At times there was a real religious feeling in the people, but it was only temporary, never lasting in its duration. Of the two, Ephraim-Israel was more wicked than Judah-Israel, and she was the first to fall under the terrible curse of the Seven Times Chastisement which was to follow on deliberate, continued, intentional, flagrant, and much-loved sin.

There followed the Assyrian Captivity, the escape, the assembling round the Black Sea, the long trek across Europe. How marvellously providential the circumstances of this last-named period were Canon Kingsley has sketched for us, in words already quoted.

Then the reassembling in a country already partly prepared for the great body of the nation, the Appointed Place. The last of such tides of reassembly was the Norman Conquest.

Hosea, in language cryptic to himself, but unsealed in "the time of the end," had declared 1198 A.D. as the earliest date upon which open Divine favour could be shown to this evil race. Hitherto it could be providentially preserved, but now it could be providentially "revived," could come to a newness of national life. In 1199 there came to the throne King John. It was due to his character that Norman and Saxon coalesced into the English nation, for they had to do it to protect themselves from the throne. Israel was now one people. As one people they obtained the Great Charter of their liberties in 1215. As one people they hurled the French out of their domains in 1217.

From this point we have endeavoured to single out the main currents, religious, and economic, which were made use of by Almighty God in preparing Israel for the times of a fuller blessing still, the times lying between 1702 and 1845. We have, furthermore, given some account of that great man of God, John Wesley, who was His greatest instrument in "increasing in us true religion," without whose existence such social and economic blessings as a free Parliament,

an adequate banking system, a restored currency, and security in this world's gear, would merely have proved unmitigated curses. In the career of John Wesley we really completed our treatment of our subject, for his work for the nation was the very crown of all blessing. Nothing greater can happen to a people than to come to have a vital belief in a God of Love Who hates sin. But we are at the present time fatally slow in following the lead which Wesley gave. We have allowed ourselves to relapse into dulness, quasi-unbelief, and formalism.

Our Lord was born in B.C. 4. One thousand nine hundred and twenty-one years before that event Abraham received his call. One thousand nine hundred and twenty-one years after that event the Israelitish Armies under Allenby recovered the City of David.

Here we have three thousand eight hundred and forty-two years of Israelitish history, beginning in blessing, and ending in blessing. But what of the interval? Constant, grieving, hurting, unloving, disobedience to a Creator whose attitude throughout to this stiffnecked, hard-hearted people may be summed up in the phrase, "I am the Lord thy God. Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." At the time of the Methodist Revival we were at our best, but we ought never to have declined from that level.

And this is why we personally are no longer of the band of those who "don't care whether we are Israel or not, so long as we do the work of Israel." Being Israel, we have most particularly sinned. We have most particularly come short of the glory of God. Our iniquities have been deeper than the iniquities of any other nation, save, perhaps, the Jews, and as regards the Jews we must remember that they have not as yet had their Wesley—at any rate in modern days. British-Israel Truth means a terribly deepened sense of responsibility.

We sometimes wonder if the hostility displayed towards British-Israel Truth by some very good men does not find its root in a further complex of the sub-conscious mind additional to that already mentioned—the silence of our school-boy's history-books as to our Israelitish origin. Does it

not in some cases proceed, in the cases of some very righteous and Godly men, from a sub-conscious aversion to having to admit themselves to be members of a race which has sinned against God as ancient Israel has sinned? This point is worth pondering. In Bishop Titcomb's life-time it was possible for him to declare, and with reason, that the Israelitish origin of the British people was a moral certainty from the fulfilment of the promises to Israel which had occurred in their history. Since his day, the Historicist school has proved that these promises must have been fulfilled to Israel in certain definite eras, particularly in the eighteenth century, during which century all God's promises to Israel were as a matter of fact fulfilled to Britain only. Our own small contribution to the subject lies in the statement that Hosea has indicated 1198 A.D. as the first possible date on which God could again show favour to Israel, and that Macaulay dates the time of definite and continued advance for Britain just one year later. This matter we have followed up to the best of our ability. Now, here are virtually three lines of evidence, not one of which any conscientious Biblical student dare ignore, all showing that Britain and Israel are one. We have also put in evidence further facts from linguistic and historical sources pointing to the same end. And if men of high principle, ordinarily capable of reason, fail to be vitally impressed by all these facts taken together, it is because something in the sub-conscious mind inhibits them from the right exercise of reason. Is it, as we have suggested, an unconscious or sub-conscious refusal to be mixed up in any way with people who have rebelled against God as Israel has rebelled?

To all God-fearing persons who oppose the teachings of British-Israel Truth we give this challenge. Dare you get straight down on your knees now and pray to God with sincerity that in this matter the Holy Spirit may give you a right reason? *If there is the slightest hesitation in accepting this challenge, that hesitation is proof of the existence of the complex.* Any trained psychologist will bear out our statement.

How this complex has been caused it is not for us to say. Whether the deficient histories, or the mental refusal to

belong to the Israelitish race, or the knowledge that acceptance of British-Israel Truth, if God illuminated your reason in the direction of that acceptance, would mean definite persecution at the hands of your fellow Christians ; whether one of these or all together have caused this psychological condition of unwillingness to give plain facts their due weight, we do not know. The only question for you is, is the complex there ?

And please do not twist our words into the outrageous statement that every man who is truly under the Holy Spirit's influence will immediately accept British-Israel teaching. Sometimes there is no interval between a prayer and its answer. Sometimes there is an interval of a generation. What we have said is, that if there be in the case of a Godly man the remotest reluctance in seeking the definite light of the Spirit in this matter, that reluctance indicates that in the possible event of Britain being Israel you don't want to know the fact. Which would prove that in this matter your reason is trammelled.

Of course the said opponents have a right immediately to hurl back our challenge upon our own devoted head. We have already accepted it. Possibly it might be well for us to devote a few lines to the origin of the work which we now bring to completion.

When a little boy, having read some tract or other on British-Israel Truth, we one day blurted out in the privacy of the paternal library, " Father, are we English the Lost Ten Tribes ? " And the venerable Wesleyan Local Preacher, to whom our question was addressed, glanced over the top of the tome he was perusing, smiled, and said, " Well, my lad, if we are not, *who are ?* " This question has not so far been answered.

Years afterwards a sister, whom God has now taken to Himself, presented us with a copy of Lancaster's *Prophecy, The War, and the Near East*. This was the first book we had met with which put the matter on a scientific basis, and our interest was greatly increased.

Later on we met with Mr. Llewellyn Thomas' *God and My Birthright*. This book is conclusive.

During the year 1926 our revered friend Dr. Mountain called our attention to the Rev. Hinds Wilkinson's *British-Israelism Examined*. To this work he was at that time engaged in writing a masterly reply, which has since been published,* and which has met with the warm reception which so scholarly a work deserved.

We have never met the Rev. Samuel Hinds Wilkinson, but from the perusal of his book we know him to be a very remarkable man. He is, so far as we are aware, the only opponent of British-Israel Truth who can, and does, fight like a gentleman. He therefore calls for the most courteous treatment, and in any reference which we shall feel ourselves called upon to make to the contents of his book, we utterly disclaim even the remotest intention of an attitude of sarcasm towards the author personally, who verily seems to have been "wounded in the house of his friends." Rightly or wrongly, we got the impression that there was not too much of the author behind the book. He seems to have been egged on to the writing of this work by other persons, who have let him down most unconscionably. It may have been an erroneous inference on our part, but from the tone of certain passages we did rather infer that Mr. Wilkinson had been pressed to cross the plank in a state of pleasing uncertainty as to whether that plank were really a bridge or a sort of magnified mousetrap, liable to tip up at a certain distance and shoot the adventurer into particularly cold water. Such paragraphs as the following are worth noting :—

"The extent of the British Dominions and the general beneficence of British government, the composite character of British subjects, and the widespread missionary operations carried on by associations of believing Christian people within the British Empire . . . seem to justify the quest for some reference, direct or indirect, to Great Britain in prophetic Scripture . . ."

"We have to say that the remarkable deliverance of Great Britain out of and through the Great War at a time when she seemed to many thoughtful students of ethnology

* *British-Israel Truth Defended*. Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.

to be showing signs of decline and decay is an exhibition of Divine grace which we cannot wholly explain."

"The writings and printed statements put forth by the British-Israel school to prove their hypothesis and to propagate it are, in some cases . . . careful and erudite."

"Could we hold the British-Israel view . . . we would hold it gladly and thankfully."

Now, note what follows. We still quote from Mr. Wilkinson. "British-Israelism is no longer in the stage of crude assumption and childish reasoning; it has developed a considerable literature, some of it very able." And again: "If there are other arguments than those we have dealt with, then they cannot be of major importance, for they have had no prominence in British-Israel literature. . . . This is *prima facie* evidence that we have had all the evidence before us before sifting it out and measuring its value."

The fact is, as Mr. Wilkinson states, that some British-Israel literature is "very able." And to no two works does this description apply with more force than to Lancaster's and Thomas' books, whose titles we have given above. Taken together, these two productions settle the question for a reasonable man. And there is no evidence that Mr. Wilkinson has ever read a line of either of them. *In fact he cannot have*, for they both deal in great detail with those careful calculations relative to the certain and ascertained dates of the conclusion of Israel's chastisement upon which all sound British-Israel teaching is based. Mr. Wilkinson is a very honest writer, so honest that over and over again has Dr. Mountain, in answering his thesis, merely had to remark, with appropriate quotation, that Mr. Wilkinson's candour had led him to surrender the whole point at issue. And if a man of this transparently honest type had ever met with the arguments from prophecy and chronology he is bound to have noted it as of "major importance." It is, on the face of it, of maximum importance. *Until Mr. Wilkinson has answered this, he has answered nothing.*

The blame seems to rest upon those persons who set him upon his task with an inadequate, ill-stocked, ill-chosen

library. Hence our remarks as to his having been wounded in the house of his friends. British-Israel Truth, without the exposition of the Seven Times and their literal fulfilment, is Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark left out. It is a house without a foundation, a man without a skeleton. But when this point is once clearly grasped, all other things will fall into their proper place. The play will go on. The house will rise on an unshakable basis. The man will walk. And the unhappy work of the unfortunate Mr. Samuel Hinds Wilkinson will be withdrawn from circulation.

Mr. Wilkinson, having unwittingly eaten his mustard without his beef, or, in other words, treated his subject without one reference to the foundation upon which our whole case rests, without one reference to the chief argument which lies to the hands of those whom he opposes, Dr. Mountain did not feel called upon in his reply to rely upon this argument at all, or even to mention it. In reading over the MS. of Dr. Mountain's book we thought this resulted in an unfortunate omission. We further thought that the argument from the Third Day should be carefully worked out, as it had never yet been. And we have always held to the belief that the essential blessing vouchsafed to Israel in the promised era of blessing was to be found in the life, the teaching, and the spiritual power of John Wesley, to whom Dr. Mountain only just alludes. We mentioned these points to Dr. Mountain, who most courteously suggested our collaborating with him in his defence of British-Israel Truth by producing a separate work which, being read in conjunction with his own, might be deemed to defend that truth at all points. Hence this book.

And our constant prayer ever since we entered upon a very arduous task has been that if the task were to the glory of God we might be prospered in the doing. But, if not, that it might please God utterly to frustrate our endeavour. Speaking with the absolute humility which alone befits a mere human being under such circumstances, we are bound to state, and do most humbly and most thankfully state, that our efforts have been most wonderfully prospered, and that those many circumstances which have arisen

during the compilation of the work which tended immediately to hinder and postpone our purpose, have, each and every one of them, been overruled to the benefit of the book and of ourselves as the writer. So far as we ourselves know ourselves, the one great aim and object of this work is to pay such tribute as one individual Israelite can to the absolute faithfulness of the covenant-keeping God of Israel. If there has been a further admixture of merely human alloy, if there has been a certain very human pleasure in endeavouring after a lucid and convincing presentation of a strongly opposed case, we are prepared to admit that we may have had a full share of such human frailty.

Now for one further reason for inditing this thesis. It has been laid on our conscience for years that, sinful, wicked, and ungrateful to a bountiful Creator as we Israelites are, we nowhere show our sinfulness, our wickedness, and our ingratitude more patently and more blatantly than in the matter of withholding God's Tenth. We give Him, as nearly as can be assessed, one-tenth of the tenth. Another work would present another opportunity of emphasising this fact. And as our readers are probably tired by this time of our own personal references to the matter, we make our concluding appeal for the tithe in the words of a great man whom we think they will be prepared to hear—the late Rev. Dr. Alexander Whyte. He who refuses to listen to our pleadings for the resumption of tithing may have his reasons for the refusal, though we do not know in what they may consist. But any man who refuses to listen to Dr. Whyte in any matter in which vital godliness is concerned is a fool, and in his conscience knows himself to be a fool. Here is Whyte's teaching on this urgent question :—

“Still the Prophetic and Apostolic benediction is pronounced over the . . . Church and her liberal-hearted people : ‘Bring ye the whole tithe into the store-house, saith the Lord of Hosts, and prove Me now herewith, if I will not open the windows of Heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it !’

“ ‘Prove Me now herewith,’ saith the Lord. And He has promised that when we prove Him with our tithes, all manner of prosperity will follow our practice of that Scriptural rule and pattern. And the rule is not a Scriptural one only. Somehow or other, the tithe, the tenth part, fills all classical literature, as well as the whole of Holy Scripture. And yet, with all that before our eyes, as plain as plain can be, here we are, at this time of day, blundering about, many of us, like Ananias and Sapphira, without any method, or principle, or rule in our givings, any more than if Scripture had never spoken on this matter, or as if a rule of love and commonsense had never been laid down. Till we waken up, and take the Patriarchal, and Mosaic, and Prophetic, and Apostolic, and even Pagan way of taxing our income, and laying aside a definite and a liberal part of it for Church and charity, we need never expect to inherit the promises, or to enter into that liberty of heart and hand which awaits us and our children. It is surely time that we had found out some better way than our present haphazard way of dealing with this great and pressing matter. . . . When some great financial genius, say, like Dr. Chalmers, arises in the Church to expound and enforce this disastrously neglected law of God, a new day will dawn on our whole religious and charitable exchequer. Then the Christian child will be brought up to tithe his pocket-money of sixpence a week for Jesus his Saviour’s sake. And his father his pound a week, or his ten pounds, or his hundred, or his thousand. And then, all we shall have to do, without straining our hearts or souring our tempers, will be calmly, and at our leisure, to exercise our best discretion as to the proportion and the destination of the stewardship-money we have had intrusted to us. And, when that Apostolic day dawns, our successors in the churches and charities of the land will look back with amazement at our poverty-stricken ways of collecting church money. And all because our eyes had, somehow, not been opened to Scriptural wisdom, and to Scriptural love, and to Scriptural liberality, in this whole matter of our Lord’s money.”

INDEX

- Abraham, 2, 23, 32, 54, 207, 209
 Act of Uniformity, 126
 Agriculture, 5, 16, 56, 204
 Ahaz, 197
 Alfred, King, 8
 Allenby, Lord, 209
 Americans, The, 120, 200
 Amsterdam, 142, 145, 156
 Anderson, Sir Robert, 8, 29, 31, 35
 Anglicanism, 101, 107, 117, 121,
 125, 135, 146, 196
 Anna the Prophetess, 42
 Anne, Queen, 116, 137, 140
 Annesley, Dr., 163
 Anthemius, Emperor, 123
 Anti-Christ, The, 52
 Apocrypha, The, 41
 "Appian Way," 33, 49
 Appointed Place, The, 47, 56, 70
 Araxes, 67
 Armada, Spanish, 81, 99, 141
 Armenia, 47, 58
 Arminianism, 17, 54, 147, 160, 193
 Arnold, Dr., 27, 199
 Artaxerxes Longimanus, 28, 29
 Arsareth, 59
 Atonement, Day of, 13
 Austro-Hungary, 57
 Authors, List of, 199
 Avebury, 34, 49
 Bacon, Sir Francis, 97
 Balaam, 55
 Bank of England, 116, 152, 155
 Beard, Dr., 101
 Becket, Thomas, 74
 Beet, Professor, 29
 Benevolences, 104
 Benjamites, The, 11, 23, 58
 Benson, Bishop, 170
 Bill of Rights, 76
 Birth-rate, 202
 Birthright, The, 54
 Black Death, The, 81
 Blake, Admiral, 112
 Bohler, Peter, 88
 Booth, General, 46
 British Church, 127
 British-Israel Truth, Hostility to,
 45, 66, 171, 209, 212
 Brixham, 147
 Bunyan, John, 102, 109
 Burnet, Dr. Gilbert, 101, 147
 Cabot, John, 92
 Calais, 97, 99
 Calf, The Golden, 57, 93
 Calvinism, 17, 54, 145, 147, 160,
 Canaanites, The, 15, 24 [165, 193
 Canterbury, 75, 98
 Capital, National, 17, 39
 Captivity, Assyrian, 25, 41, 58, 208
 Captivity, Babylonish, 14, 25, 44, 58
 Charles I, 103, 106, 111, 121, 126
 Charles II, 110, 115, 116, 126, 128,
 Chatham, 100 [130, 137
 Civil War, The, 108
 Clarendon, Lord, 127
 Clayton, John, 167
 Colgrave and Short, 32
 Columbus, Christopher, 92
 Compton, Bishop, 144
 Constantinople, 81, 92, 96
 Council of Arles, 127
 Crimea, The, 43, 60, 67
 Criminal Law, Israelitish, 7
 Cromwell, Oliver, 80, 87, 100-113,
 115, 117, 119, 126, 130, 148
 Cromwell, Thomas, 103
 Cruden, Alexander, 7, 56
 Currency, Restoration of, 18, 152
 Danes, The, 68, 99
 Daniel, 27, 48, 64, 97, 122
 Dartmouth, Lord, 146
 David, 12, 15, 17, 22, 55, 57
 Davies, Major L. M., 32
 Declaration of Right, 134
 Declaration of Indulgence, 137, 146
 Denmark, George of, 140 [149
 Dispensing Power, The, 132, 136,
 Divine Right, The, 106, 121, 131,
 Doyle, Sir A. C., 81, 199 [149
 Drake, Sir Francis, 99
 Dutch, The, 68, 140, 143, 200
 Ecclesiastical Commission, 137, 144,
 Economics, Biblical, 9, 14 [146
 Edward I, 78
 Edward VI, 81, 93, 125
 Egypt, 2, 13, 17, 24, 207
 Elizabeth, Queen, 81, 90, 97, 101,
 104, 117, 125, 129
 Empire Day, 171
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 89, 92
 Esar-Haddon, 38
 Esdras, 59
 Euphrates, 59, 69
 Evangelicalism, 117, 190, 195
 Exchequer Bills, 154
 Exclusion Bill, 128, 131
 Exodus, 2, 60
 Ezra, 43, 57, 58
 Farrar, Dean, 26
 Fecundity, Israelitish, 24, 53, 54,
 201, 204, 207
 Festivals, The, 9, 10, 44
 Feudalism, Fall of, 83
 Flood, The, 31, 49
 Freeman, Professor E. A., 68
 Froude, J. A., 94, 199
 Futurists, The, 26, 46, 48
 da Gama, Vasco, 92
 Gardiner, Dr. S. R., 123
 "Gates of Israel, The," 60
 George I, 117

- Georgia, 167
 Getae, The, 60
 Gibbon, Edward, 122, 199
 Gordon, Lord George, 179
 Gosse, Sir Edmund, 68, 198 [151
 Great War, The, 2, 119, 123, 142,
 Guinness, Dr. Grattan, 27, 29, 37,
 39, 98, 197
 Gutenberg, Johannes, 92
 Harvey, James, 167
 Henry II, 73
 Henry III, 76
 Henry VII, 92
 Henry VIII, 79, 87, 92, 93, 103, 105,
 117, 125, 129
 Henry, Mathew, 43
 Herodotus, 60
 Hiram, 18
 Historicists, The, 26, 47, 52, 210
 Holland, 68, 141
 Honorius, Emperor, 122
 Hosea, 56, 59, 71, 208, 210
 Howard, John, 179
 Howorth, Sir Henry, 32, 50
 Hughes, Hugh Price, 46
 Huguenots, The, 98, 112
 Hume, David, 123
 Huss, John, 88
 Huxley, Professor, 68
 Imperial Expansion, 46, 199-201
 Ingham, Benjamin, 167, 168
 Inquisition, The, 112
 Ironsides, The, 108, 111, 113
 Isaac, 23
 Isaiah, 56, 57
 Jacobitism, 117, 152
 Jamaica, 112
 James, St., 43
 James I, 100, 105, 121
 James II, 75, 80, 104, 111, 116, 128,
 130, 135-149
 Jeffreys, Lord, 109, 132, 137
 Jeroboam, 41, 43, 57, 93 [97, 209
 Jerusalem, 8, 10, 13, 18, 21, 27, 52,
 Jesuits, The, 136, 138, 145, 176
 Jews, The, 27, 37, 44, 75, 80, 114,
 John, King, 75, 80, 208 [169, 209
 Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 29, 179, 181,
 Jonson, Ben, 114 [199
 Joseph, 24
 Josephus, 7, 12, 16, 41, 43, 69
 Jotham, 197 [201-4
Journal, Wesley's, 161, 178-196,
 A Kempis, Thomas, 164, 168
 Kingsley, Canon, 70, 199, 208
 Lancaster, G. H., 27, 28, 30, 31, 37,
 93, 98, 197, 211
 Langland, William, 85
 Language Test, The, 61, 67
 Lansdell, Dr. H., 96
 Latham, Dr., 45
 Latimer, Bishop, 113, 171
 Laud, Archbishop, 106
 Law, William, 165, 189, 191
 Levites, The, 6, 8, 23, 58
Lex Talionis, 12
 Literary Criticisms, Wesley's, 179-
 Locke, John, 154 [182
 Lollards, The, 81, 87, 89, 95, 125
 Louis XIV, 106, 136, 141
 Luther, Martin, 45, 88, 89, 93, 189
 Lyson, Canon, 61
 Macaulay, Lord, 68, 72, 73, 76, 110,
 152, 199, 210
 Magna Charta, 76, 104, 208
 Magyars, The, 61, 96 [130
 Major-Generals, Cromwell's, 110,
 Marlborough, Duke of, 116, 142, 145
 Mary of Orange, 116, 132, 137, 140,
 143
 Mary Tudor, 81, 90, 97, 98, 119, 125
 Maynard, Serjeant, 149
 McCormack, R., 71 [195
 Methodists, The, 91, 117, 166, 194,
 Methodism, Spread of, 162, 176,
 187, 194
 Methodist Revival, The, 152, 170,
 194, 206, 209
 Midrash, The, 14
 Millennium, The, 42, 49, 54, 205
 Milman, Dean, 10, 197
 Missions, Foreign, 3, 21
 Moffatt, Dr. James, 31, 70
 Monarchy, Israelitish, 14, 25
 Monmouth, Duke of, 80, 132, 142
 Monopolies, The, 129
 Montague, Charles, 154 [129, 134
 de Montfort, Simon, 73, 77, 80, 100,
 Moravians, The, 88, 168, 171, 191
 Morgan, William, 167
 Morton, Dr. H. C., 50
 Moses, 8, 12, 88, 207
 Mountain, Dr. James, 51, 61, 212,
 214
 Muggleton, Lodowic, 109
 Muller, Max, 61
 Nabonassar, 37, 197
 Nathan, 55
 National Debt, The, 152, 156, 200
 Nebuchadnezzar, 30, 62
 Nehemiah, 43, 57
 Nero, 52
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 35, 154
 Nitschmann, David, 168
 Noah, 31, 49
 Normans, The, 68, 208
 Norway, 57, 69, 99
 O'Connor, T. P., 178
 Ogilethorpe, General, 167
 Oldcastle, Sir John, 90
 Palestine, 47, 67, 70
 Parliamentary Government, 8, 77,
 104, 107, 129, 149-152, 208
 Parvolution, 50

- Paterson, William, 155
 Paul, St. 23, 88, 161, 190
 Peasants' Rising, The, 85, 89
 Pekah, 197
 Peter, St., 30, 71
 Pharisees, The, 12
 "Pilgrimage of Grace," The, 95, 103
 Pitt, William, 179
 Poitevins, The, 77
 Poor-Law, Israelitish, 6
 Power, Maritime, 46, 55
 Praeterists, The, 26, 46, 48
 Presbyterians, The, 106, 111, 127
 Price, Dr., 202
 Price, McC., 32
 Protestantism, 117, 131
 Provençals, The, 77
 Provisors, 77
 Puritans, The, 12, 20, 91, 101, 107,
 113, 117, 121, 128, 135, 196
 Rabbi, The Chief, 44, 58
 Reform Act, 130
 Rehoboam, 8, 41, 43, 57
 Republicanism, 120
 Revolution, French, 19, 37, 39
 Revolution, English, 121, 149
 Richard I, 75
 Riothamus, 123
 Ripley, Professor, 45
 Rome, Imperial, 62, 122, 200
 Rome, Papal, 52, 62, 75, 107, 119,
 Rupert, Prince, 108 [121, 126
 Ruskin, John, 118, 199
 Sabbath, The, 12
 Sacrilege, 86, 95
 Sandwich, Battle of, 76
 Sanhedrim, The, 8
 Scotland, 57, 80, 100, 107, 111
 Scott, Sir Walter, 75, 199
 Scythia, 60
 Sedgemoor, 68, 132
 Sennacherib, 44
 Sepharad (or Saparda), 44
 Serfdom, 84, 86
 Seven Bishops, The, 139, 146
 Seven Times, The, 27, 30, 35, 37,
 38, 49, 64, 69, 93, 100, 197, 206,
 208, 214
 Shakespeare, William, 90, 114
 Sheba, Queen of, 18, 22
 Shirley Poppy, The, 50
 Simeon, 28
 Smith, Adam, 199
 Smith, Professor David, 19
 Smith, Merton, 44
 Solomon, 15, 17, 22, 93
 Somers, Lord Chancellor, 140, 154
 Southey, Dr. Robert, 161, 169, 192,
 Spangenberg, Gottlieb, 168 [199
 Spiritism, 83, 184
 Standing Army, 104, 110, 130
 Statute of Labourers, 85
 Stephen, King, 73
 Stone Kingdom, The, 62
 Sweden, 57, 69
 Sydney, Sir Philip, 91
 Taylor, Bishop, 164, 190
 Third Day, The, 71, 116, 205, 214
 Thomas, Llewellyn, 27, 30, 37, 51,
 72, 98, 197, 212
 Tiglath-Pileser, 197
 Titcomb, Bishop, 210
 "Time," Duration of, 30, 48
 "Time of the End," 93, 97
 "Times, Latter," 42, 47, 51, 53, 205
 Tithes, 3, 5, 9, 12, 14, 171, 215
 Tobit, 44
 Toleration Act, 128
 Torbay, 146
 Trading Classes, Rise of, 105
 Turenne, Marshal-General, 109
 Turk, European, 61, 92, 96
 Turner, Sharon, 67, 69, 162, 199
 Tyler, Wat, 85, 92
 Waldenses, The, 112
 Wales, 79, 100
 Walpole, Horace, 174
 Warren, Samuel, 198
 Warming-pan Conspiracy, The, 139
 Waterloo, 91, 142, 201
 Wealth, 4, 18, 157
 Weeks, Prophecy of the, 28
 Weldon, B. de W., 60, 63, 72
 Wesley, Charles, 166, 168
 Wesley, John, 23, 39, 81, 87, 117,
 119, 125, 152, 158, 159-196, 199,
 201, 208, 214
 Wesley, Samuel, 137, 139, 158, 162
 Wesley, Susannah, 162, 167
 West, Isles of the, 47, 67
 Whitefield, George, 159, 167, 169,
 174, 187, 191, 193
 Wilberforce, William, 179
 Wilderness, The, 47, 56
 Wilkinson, S. Hinds, 212
 William III, 80, 100, 116, 121, 128,
 130, 140-158
 Withers, Hartley, 20
 Wool Trade, 78, 86
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 94, 98 [148
 Worship, Synagogue, 13, 117, 133,
 Worship, Temple, 13, 25, 117, 125,
 133, 148
 Whyte, Dr. Alexander, 215
 Wycliffe, John, 81, 87, 100, 125, 129
 Year-Day Theory, The, 27, 48
 Year, Ancient Solar, 35, 49
 Year, Jubilee, 6, 7
 Year, Lunar, 28, 30
 Year, Prophetic, 29, 31, 37
 Year, Sabbatic, 7, 14, 28
 Year, Solar, 28, 30
 Zero-point, The, 36
 Zinzendorf, Count von, 88, 179, 192

PREVIOUS WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

"Discerning members of the public are gradually becoming aware that a new and original writer has arisen. This new writer is Mr. P. W. Thompson. He thinks for himself; he is very happily free from the current peculiarities of language and phrasing, and a breath of fresh air moves continually through his pages." — REV. H. C. MORTON, M.A., Ph.D.

THE OLD BOOK AND THE NEW AGE. 5/-. Post free, 5/4.

"Written with rare skill."—*Liverpool Daily Post*.

"Four vivid and compelling essays."—*The Life of Faith*.

THE WHOLE TITHE. 6/-. Post free, 6/4.

"A notable book."—*The Jewish Chronicle*.

"An astonishing book."—*The Daily Dispatch*.

"An arresting book."—*The Accountant*.

THINE INCREASE. 2/6. Post free, 2/9.

"Earnest and vigorously written."—*The Spectator*.

"Persuasive, interesting, original."—*The Wesleyan Methodist*.

THE PROBLEM OF SPIRITISM. 3/6. Post free, 3/9.

"A piece of charming writing."—*Sheffield Telegraph*.

"Exceptionally readable."—*The Christian*.

For further Press notices see following pages. May be obtained from all booksellers, from the Publishers, or direct from

THE COVENANT PUBLISHING CO., LTD.

6, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1.

THE OLD BOOK AND THE NEW AGE

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.,
Author of *The Whole Tithe*.

Of all Booksellers.

Cloth Boards, 5/- net.

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LTD.,

24-5, Paternoster Row, E.C.4.

99, George Street, Edinburgh.

PRESS NOTICES.

"The Author, holding that 'the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as originally inspired by the Almighty, are, when correctly translated and interpreted, without error,' proceeds to survey a good deal of their teaching, in respect particularly of such subjects as cosmology and economics. He ranges over a considerable field."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

"If one is looking for something vigorous in thought and stimulating, here it is. The writer is already an experienced author. It is refreshing to find an occasional writer of wide experience and reading who does his own thinking, and thinking of a high order. The book abounds in practical wisdom, sound learning, unobtrusive humour, and reverence for the Old Book."—*Moody Monthly* (Chicago).

"Written with rare skill. Whatever the reader's own opinions are on inspiration, he cannot read this book without finding something to interest him."—*Liverpool Daily Post*.

"A study of the Scriptures as appealing to people no longer maintaining an attitude of unquestioning adherence to tradition."—*The Scotsman*.

"Whole-hearted faith in the Bible is a striking feature of this layman's study of the moral and intellectual authority of the Book."—*London Quarterly Review*.

"The world is shown to be unprogressive; it is not in a state of equilibrium, because the seat of authority in morals and religion has been taken out of true position, the whole of the Scriptures, and no longer has a fixed point."—*Birmingham Daily Post*.

"It is the glory of the Word of God that an amateur can sometimes give points to the professional student, and the specialist in Bible study can learn something to his profit from the writings of a layman. So it is in the case before us. The writer is a devout

student, both of Scripture and of his own times, and his thoughts on both prove to be very well worth reading. They are fresh and stimulating. The book consists of four essays, each full of matter. In the third we are glad to see that he writes with great common sense upon the question of Evolution."—*The Record*.

"A thoughtful book which deals with great subjects. Students of the Word of God will find in this volume much that will strengthen faith and remove difficulties. The work should have a steadying and an uplifting influence upon all who read it, and should make a wide appeal to the religious public."—*The Life of Faith*.

"The Author writes with conviction and courage, and no reader of this interesting and sincere book will disagree with his conclusion: 'The forces and faculties of this New Age will, when used with utter honesty, only lead to the re-establishing of the Old Book.'"—*The Methodist Leader*.

"The ground covered is extensive, and the reader is guided through the realms of philosophy, science and religion by one who is much travelled in these lands. The theme which governs the work is that the Bible . . . is an unexplored book, and only as further exploration is made shall we find a solution to our problems."—*Mid-Cumberland Herald*.

"Admirable, timely, and fascinating."—*The Banner of Israel*.

"Written by an out-and-out believer in the Bible, with force and conviction, with point and wit. From beginning to end the volume is full of interest, and the theme is elucidated with a great wealth of illustration. There are many outspoken things in this robust and virile book, and there is much quiet humour also. It will tend to increase the reputation of the Author as a shrewd critic and commentator."—*West Cumberland Times*.

"The reader will find considerable agreement with the Author's analysis of the present age."—*The Guardian*.

"The Author deals pleasantly with various topics—the evils of the merely utilitarian view of life, the economic teaching of Scripture, and Biblical criticism and interpretation."—*The Expository Times*.

"The writer's sympathies are constructive."—*The Christian*.

"The Author holds that the Bible is so new that it is still unexplored by many who presume to write about it and still only partially understood by many of its devoted friends. He has written a most helpful book."—*The Western Recorder* (Louisville, Kentucky).

"A book of real interest and brilliance and profit for us all."—*The Fundamentalist*.

"We welcome most heartily this new writer in the realm of scientific investigation, Biblical interpretation, and Christian apologetics. It has been a real pleasure to read this book. It is so reverent in its tone, so spiritual in its purpose, so scholarly

and original in its thoughts, and so loyal, from first to last, to 'The Old Book.' . . . It is eminently constructive ; and, moreover, there is a freshness and breeziness about the book which fascinate the reader. We read nearly the whole of its 176 pages at one sitting, and were sorry to be interrupted in our delightful perusal. The book evinces wide and voluminous research, and is bound to be of great service."—REV. JAMES MOUNTAIN, D.D., in *The Bible Call*.

" Mr. Thompson has laid a debt upon the Christian Church in general and the ' Fundamentalists ' in particular. His sane, well-balanced judgments—obviously the outcome of clear, unbiased thinking—will carry conviction to every honest enquirer. His breadth of grasp is amazing, as well as his range of vision ; and his humorous touches, together with his perfect English, relieve the cultured reader of any sense of dulness. The Old Book can do with more Apologists of Mr. Thompson's order, and the same may be said of true Science."—REV. A. F. FRYER, M.Sc., late Mercer Scholar of the Victoria University of Manchester.

THINE INCREASE

AN ENCOURAGEMENT TO SYSTEMATIC GIVING.

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.

Author of *The Whole Tithe*.

Of all Booksellers.

Cloth Boards, 2/6 net.

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LTD.,

24-5, Paternoster Row, E.C.4.

99, George Street, Edinburgh.

PRESS NOTICES.

"This is a very earnest and vigorously written plea for almsgiving. The writer is careful to emphasize that the giver is invariably blessed with an increase of this world's goods, but perhaps that argument is unavoidable nowadays."—*The Spectator*.

"A book on systematic giving ought to have a large circulation, especially when it is by a competent layman. This duty is urged with reason, anecdote, and sentiment in THINE INCREASE. The task needed doing, and it is well done here."—*The Expository Times*.

"Many striking illustrations of the blessing that rests upon generous giving, and much suggestive exposition of Bible teaching on the subject, make this a pleasant book to read, and it is certainly a book with a much-needed message for all the churches."—*London Quarterly Review*.

"The Author of *The Whole Tithe* is here again concerned with the duty of systematic giving."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

"He offers some valuable suggestions to those who, by reason of poverty, are unable to contribute largely to charitable causes."—*T.P.'s and Cassell's Weekly*.

"He writes with point."—*The Record*.

"His reasoning is convincing."—*The Methodist Recorder*.

"He writes vigorously, with a quiet humour that illuminates his arguments."—*The Church of England Newspaper*.

"One wonders whether some financially embarrassed societies would not do well to incur another expense, and broadcast this book. It is a seed which would bring forth an hundredfold."—*Mid-Cumberland Herald*.

"The Author writes pleasantly and happily, and the numerous anecdotes serve not only to brighten up the pages, but also to make plain the aptness and truth of his argument. Christians generally will find this book a sure and safe guide along a path which leads to a wonderfully rich experience."—*The Record*. (Second Notice.)

" This most persuasive, interesting, and original brochure. . . . If it attains the circulation it deserves, the problem of Church finance will be well on the road to solution."—*The Wesleyan Methodist*.

" There ought to be an eager desire to obtain this book. It points the unfailing way to the opening of Heaven's windows—windows the whole Church desires to be open and will be when the Lord's Portion is placed upon the altar. . . . Here and there are quaint stories and passages that cannot but burn deeply into all who peruse these pages."—*The Methodist Leader*.

" This little book is strongly commended to the attention of the reading public. Its basis is Scriptural, its arguments trenchant, its illustrations apt."—*The Banner of Israel*.

" The question of ' giving ' as it should be considered by a Christian who is anxious to receive *all* that God is prepared to give, is dealt with in this valuable, thought-compelling book."—*Ready*.

" A book of quality, original and suggestive, proving the Author to be a worthy penman."—*The Lord's Portion*.

" An eloquent and convincing plea for more liberal contributions to our churches and public institutions."—*The Carlisle Journal*.

" The Author is held in regard by many for his very useful volume, *The Whole Tithe*. Here he follows up the subject . . . indicating a system adapted to the circumstances of those who are not able to devise liberal things. The pages are calculated to convey timely instruction on an important subject."—*The Christian*.

" All the good things we were able to write about *The Whole Tithe* may be repeated concerning this. We commend the book not only to preachers and teachers, but to the rank and file of our Churches."—*The Methodist Times*.

" This convincing advocate of tithing handles his great theme well."—*West Cumberland Times*.

THINE INCREASE THE WHOLE TITHE

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LTD.

PRESS NOTICES.

"In these two volumes the Author deals exhaustively and conclusively with the subject of systematic giving from the Scriptural and the practical points of view. By close reasoning and a wealth of apt illustration he shows the duty and the advantage of devoting a definite proportion of our income to God. He lays down no hard-and-fast rule as to what the proportion should be. Every man must settle that with God and his own conscience. The Scriptural teaching is clearly set forth, and the delight and advantage of the practice are illustrated from a wide range of Biography and Literature.

"He writes with grace and charm, as well as with cogency. He has also a gift of striking epigram. Ministers will find these books invaluable in the work of instructing their people on the duty of Christian giving."—*The Baptist Times*.

"THINE INCREASE is assured of a kindly reception, like that accorded to the Author's previous notable work, *The Whole Tithe*."—*The Jewish Chronicle*.

"In these fascinating and delightfully written volumes the whole subject of Stewardship is elaborately and skilfully handled."—PHILO, in *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle*.

THE WHOLE TITHE

A STUDY IN SYSTEMATIC GIVING, HISTORICAL AND PRACTICAL.

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.

(Member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants).

Of all Booksellers.

Cloth Boards, 6/- net.

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LTD.,

24-5, Paternoster Row, E.C.4.

99, George Street, Edinburgh.

PRESS NOTICES.

"This book is of timely interest in view of present-day discussions. The Author is a financial expert as well as an ecclesiastical enthusiast, and his deductions deserve most careful consideration alike from the economic and spiritual standpoints."—*The Scotsman*.

"A fresh and informing study. . . . The book has a special claim to attention as the work of a financial expert who is deeply interested in the subject, and has carefully thought it out in all its applications."—*London Quarterly Review*.

"An astonishing book which should get somehow into the hands of every man who is bothered by the rights and wrongs of giving to charitable and other causes nowadays. The testimony adduced in this virile book gives pause to the sceptic and hope to the kindly disposed."—*The Daily Dispatch*.

"A notable book ; an arresting book ; a book to be not only read but studied. The historical portion deals with the origin, nature, and extent of the Jewish tithe, and contains an amount of reasoned argument and information on the subject which cannot so far as we know be found elsewhere. . . . This really remarkable work."—*The Accountant*.

"The argument is confirmed by an interesting appeal to the practice of devout men who have given willingly of their means to religion."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

"The ingenious calculations of the Author are exceedingly interesting. The tone of the book is marked by a naivete which is as rare as it is attractive."—BENAMMI, in *The Jewish Chronicle*.

"We should like to commend this book to the attention of all those who have to deal with Church finance. . . . We hope it will get a wide circulation."—*The Church of England Newspaper*.

"Written on behalf of hospitals and other charities . . . endeavours to apply Biblical lore to present-day charitable duties."—*T.P.'s and Cassell's Weekly*.

"The writer has carefully thought out his deductions, and presents us with a reasoned appeal on behalf of his ideal."—*The Guardian*.

"Most men desire guidance in the formation of a right conscience on this practical problem . . . the Author gives advice which is sound and helpful."—*The Record*.

"A valuable and comprehensive study of a most neglected subject . . . the chapter on historic examples of systematic and generous givers is delightful reading."—*The Life of Faith*.

"Eminently readable, and the result of devout investigation in regard to a subject of profound importance."—*The Christian*.

"This book is worth buying for its earnest and reasoned argument for a larger liberality, for the interesting light it throws on the generosity of some of our greatest literary men, and not least for its collection of Biblical texts inculcating the duty of liberality."—*The Expository Times*.

"The need of a standard work on the subject of giving has at last been met. Every one, particularly ministers, have here something to study with profit. The volume is the result of mature thought. It is interesting and arresting, but, more even than that, it is convincing."—*The Wesleyan Methodist*.

"Perusal of this book would make many resolve to give more systematically. We like the book because its Author admits that 'one's dogmatism can only be binding upon oneself'—so unlike many 'tithers.'"—*The Methodist Times*.

"THE WHOLE TITHE has been warmly received and has proved of great service to Christian congregations."—*The Methodist Times*. (Second Notice.)

"We marvel at the minuteness of the Author's study, and the accuracy of his conclusions."—*The Methodist Recorder*.

"Fluency in the manipulation of figures is not always allied with interesting writing, but here we have interest which grows wider and deeper as the reader proceeds. It is a book that ought to be widely read."—*The Methodist Leader*.

"A Chartered Accountant describes the Biblical tithe system. An interesting tabular statement is given showing the precise sums which a Hebrew farmer paid, reckoned in English money, over a term of years."—*International Review of Missions*.

"Tithe is an important thing, but it may not always be interesting. With the treatment accorded to it by the Author it is both. He writes with great persuasiveness, clarity and force."—*West Cumberland Times*.

"This is a standard work on the subject of Christian giving, which was much needed. It is a useful reference book, which should be added to every Christian's library."—*The Christian Herald*.

"This book may be trusted to find its own constituency in the country. It bears evidence of wide reading, but the writer is slave to no man's opinions. The style is clear, and there is a certain quiet humour which lights up many a page."—*Mid-Cumberland Herald*.

"This book sets forth in clear, concise terms the teaching of the Old and New Testament Scriptures upon the important subject of giving. It is ably written, and is a valuable addition to our religious literature. The Mosaic Law as to the tithe is fully explained, and concrete examples given."—*The Banner of Israel*.

"An interesting, lucid account of the ancient Jewish tithe system set forth in a scholarly style. The book closes with a short résumé of the lives of several famous men who were examples of systematic giving . . . outlined in a vivid, forceful way. Altogether a readable and rather unusual book."—*Nursing Mirror*.

"The exact estimate of an obedient Israelite's annual tithe payments, and the purposes for which they were used, is carefully calculated, and the proportions applied to the Christian in THE WHOLE TITHE. It will prove helpful for all who want to apply what 'happened to Israel for examples, and are written for our admonition.'"

"This book gives clearer exact definitions than any other commentator upon the subject that I know, and points to the one way in which the needs of the 'house of God' can be fully supplied, and suppliers be fully blessed."—REV. HUBERT BROOKE, M.A., in *The Life of Faith*.

"This is just the book which multitudes of Christians need. Clear, concise—and to my mind very largely conclusive—I would strongly recommend the book."—*The Fundamentalist*.

"The Author treats his subject in a most illuminating and interesting way. . . . No student of the Jewish problem should miss reading this book."—*Immanuel's Witness*.

THE PROBLEM OF SPIRITISM

By

P. W. THOMPSON, M.A.

Author of *The Whole Tithe*.

Of all Booksellers.

Cloth Boards, 3/6 net.

MARSHALL BROTHERS, LTD.,

24-5, Paternoster Row, E.C.4.

99, George Street, Edinburgh.

PRESS NOTICES.

"An endeavour to decide the merits and demerits of the matter, once and for all."—*The Occult Review*.

"This is not a crabbed controversial production, but a short work of high literary merit. It should be read by all who revel in a piece of charming writing, evidencing the utmost good humour and a sane and well-balanced respect for truth."—*The Sheffield Telegraph*.

"The pages abound in facts and arguments such as the inquiring student may demand, but they are presented in a form that is exceptionally readable. The pages are informing in an eminent degree."—*The Christian*.

"This protest is powerful and timely."—*The London Quarterly Review*.

"A piece of vigorous writing enlivened by a strong dash of humour and sarcasm. It gives a popular account of various spiritistic phenomena."—*The Expository Times*.

"The Author has collected a good deal of curious material."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

"A very thorough examination of the alleged revelations provided through seances."—*The Scots Observer*.

"An impressive Christian case against meddling with the occult and the preternatural."—*The Daily Dispatch*.

"Written by an experienced Author of sound faith but cautious spirit."—*The Moody Monthly*.

"We have not met anything in so short a volume dealing with this theme so adequately."—*The Methodist Leader*.

"The Author's unconventional, though earnest and thoughtful, treatment of an important and difficult subject, should prove useful to all, and especially to those who for any reason are tempted to obtain communication with their own relatives who have passed within the veil."—*The Record*.

"A well-balanced enquiry into a subject which demands the notice and the judgment of the preacher."—*The Methodist Times*.

"The cult of Spiritism is so aggressive to-day that this book is welcome."—*The Christian Herald*.

"A wonderful collection, told in a rather jocose spirit."—*The Church Times*.

"It is no dry examination of the subject which the Author presents."—*The Birkenhead News*.

"The tone of the book, though Protestant, is sound and reverent."—*The Tablet*.

"This writer again shows an earnest desire, not to urge his readers to accept his own views, but to help them to form their own conclusions. The book is well worth careful reading by all interested in the subject."—*The West Cumberland Times*.

"Admirable alike in the method adopted and the spirit evinced throughout. There is a sanity and balance about this book which predisposes one to the Author's conclusions."—*The Mid-Cumberland Herald*.

THE NATIONAL MESSAGE AND BANNER

Established January, 1922, by Patriotic Britons
to supply a weekly Message to Britain and the
Dominions beyond the seas

CIRCULATING throughout Anglo-Saxondom.
Should be read by every Bible and University and
Theological Student. Over one hundred contributors,
whose articles are unique, throwing light on Bible
Prophecy turned into History such as is found in no
other journal. Read it and see for yourself, and judge
it by its fruits.

Read and commended by Bishops and Clergy of the
Anglican Church, by Ministers of the Nonconformist
Churches, by Statesmen, members of the leading Pro-
fessions, and by thinking people in all sections of the
Commonwealth and the outside nations.

Post free, 12s. per annum.

Half-yearly, 6s.

Single copies, 2d. each. Postage, 1d.

Try it for six months. You will never regret it.

ADDRESS:

THE NATIONAL MESSAGE LIMITED
6 BUCKINGHAM GATE, LONDON, S.W.1, ENGLAND

